

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, August 1, 1985

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Robert A. Rusbult, Emmanuel Baptist Church, Penn Yan, NY, offered the following prayer:

If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.—II Chronicles 7:14.

God, our Heavenly Father, thank You for the dedication of these men and women in this great Chamber. We pray for wisdom, understanding, and justice to prevail in their dealings with each other and for the good of our land.

Help them to seek their strength from above and may they lead our people in the proper paths. We know that our Congress faces difficult problems and decisions, but may You give them the insight to see clearly the way they should go for the good of our great Nation.

May the blessing of Your love rest upon our President. We pray for his physical needs and for complete healing in his body.

We commit our thoughts to Thee for we pray in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 125, answered "present" 4, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

YEAS—272

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Ackerman | Feighan | Miller (WA) |
| Addabbo | Fish | Mineta |
| Akaka | Flippo | Moakley |
| Alexander | Florio | Mollohan |
| Anderson | Foglietta | Montgomery |
| Andrews | Foley | Moody |
| Annunzio | Fowler | Moore |
| Anthony | Frank | Morrison (CT) |
| Applegate | Franklin | Morrison (WA) |
| Archer | Frost | Mrazek |
| Aspin | Fuqua | Murphy |
| Atkins | Garcia | Murtha |
| AuCoin | Gejdenson | Myers |
| Barnard | Gephardt | Natcher |
| Barnes | Gibbons | Nelson |
| Bateman | Gilman | Nichols |
| Bedell | Glickman | Nowak |
| Beilenson | Gonzalez | O'Brien |
| Bennett | Gordon | Oberstar |
| Berman | Gradison | Obey |
| Bevill | Gray (IL) | Olin |
| Blaggi | Gray (PA) | Ortiz |
| Boggs | Green | Owens |
| Boland | Guarini | Panetta |
| Boner (TN) | Hall (OH) | Pease |
| Bonior (MI) | Hall, Ralph | Pepper |
| Bonker | Hamilton | Perkins |
| Borski | Hammerschmidt | Petri |
| Bosco | Hansen | Pickle |
| Boucher | Hatcher | Price |
| Boxer | Hawkins | Quillen |
| Breaux | Henry | Rangel |
| Brooks | Hertel | Ray |
| Broomfield | Holt | Regula |
| Brown (CA) | Howard | Reid |
| Broyhill | Hoyer | Richardson |
| Bruce | Hubbard | Rinaldo |
| Bryant | Huckaby | Robinson |
| Burton (CA) | Hughes | Rodino |
| Bustamante | Hutto | Roe |
| Byron | Hyde | Rose |
| Campbell | Jenkins | Rostenkowski |
| Carper | Johnson | Rowland (CT) |
| Carr | Jones (OK) | Rowland (GA) |
| Chappell | Jones (TN) | Roybal |
| Cheney | Kanjorski | Rudd |
| Clinger | Kaptur | Russo |
| Coats | Kastenmeier | Sabo |
| Coelho | Kennelly | Savage |
| Coleman (TX) | Kildee | Scheuer |
| Collins | Kleczka | Schneider |
| Conyers | Kolter | Schumer |
| Cooper | LaFalce | Sharp |
| Coyne | Lagomarsino | Shelby |
| Crockett | Leath (TX) | Sisisky |
| Daniel | Lehman (CA) | Skellton |
| Darden | Lehman (FL) | Slattery |
| Daschle | Leland | Smith (FL) |
| de la Garza | Levin (MI) | Smith (IA) |
| Dellums | Levine (CA) | Smith (NE) |
| Derrick | Lipinski | Snyder |
| Dicks | Long | Solarz |
| DioGuardi | Lowry (WA) | Spratt |
| Dixon | Luken | St Germain |
| Donnelly | Lundine | Staggers |
| Dorgan (ND) | MacKay | Stallings |
| Dowdy | Manton | Stark |
| Downey | Markay | Stenholm |
| Duncan | Martinez | Stokes |
| Dwyer | Matsui | Stratton |
| Dyson | Mavroules | Studds |
| Early | Mazzoli | Sweeney |
| Eckart (OH) | McCain | Swift |
| Eckert (NY) | McCloskey | Synar |
| Edgar | McCollum | Tallon |
| Edwards (CA) | McCurdy | Tauzin |
| English | McEwen | Thomas (GA) |
| Erdreich | McHugh | Torres |
| Evans (IL) | McKinney | Torricelli |
| Fascell | Mica | Towns |
| Fawell | Mikulski | Trafficant |
| Fazio | Miller (CA) | Traxler |

Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman

Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wise

Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (MO)

NAYS—125

| | | |
|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| Armey | Gunderson | Parris |
| Badham | Hartnett | Pashayan |
| Bartlett | Hendon | Penny |
| Barton | Hiller | Porter |
| Bentley | Hillis | Pursell |
| Bereuter | Hopkins | Ridge |
| Billirakis | Hunter | Ritter |
| Bliley | Ireland | Roberts |
| Boehlert | Jacobs | Roemer |
| Boulter | Kasich | Rogers |
| Brown (CO) | Kolbe | Roukema |
| Burton (IN) | Kramer | Saxton |
| Callahan | Latta | Schaefer |
| Carney | Leach (IA) | Schroeder |
| Chappie | Lent | Schuetz |
| Cobey | Lewis (CA) | Schulze |
| Coble | Lewis (FL) | Sensenbrenner |
| Coleman (MO) | Lightfoot | Shaw |
| Combest | Livingston | Shuster |
| Conte | Lloyd | Sikorski |
| Coughlin | Lott | Siljander |
| Courter | Lowery (CA) | Slaughter |
| Craig | Lujan | Smith (NH) |
| Dannemeyer | Lungren | Smith, Denny |
| Daub | Mack | Smith, Robert |
| DeWine | Madigan | Snowe |
| Dickinson | Marlenee | Solomon |
| Dornan (CA) | Martin (IL) | Spence |
| Dreier | Martin (NY) | Stangeland |
| Durbin | McCandless | Strang |
| Edwards (OK) | McGrath | Stump |
| Emerson | McKernan | Sundquist |
| Evans (IA) | McMillan | Swindall |
| Fiedler | Meyers | Tauke |
| Fields | Michel | Taylor |
| Frenzel | Miller (OH) | Vucanovich |
| Gallo | Mollinari | Weber |
| Gekas | Monson | Whittaker |
| Gingrich | Moorhead | Wolf |
| Goodling | Nielson | Young (AK) |
| Gregg | Oxley | Zschau |
| Grotberg | Packard | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Davis
Dymally
Kostmayer
Lantos

NOT VOTING—32

| | | |
|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Bates | Hefelt | Rahall |
| Chandler | Horton | Roth |
| Clay | Jeffords | Seiberling |
| Crane | Jones (NC) | Shumway |
| DeLay | Kemp | Skeen |
| Dingell | Kindness | Smith (NJ) |
| Ford (MI) | Loeffler | Thomas (CA) |
| Ford (TN) | McDade | Udall |
| Gaydos | Mitchell | Weaver |
| Hayes | Neal | Young (FL) |
| Hefner | Oskar | |

□ 1020

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House with amendments

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 817. An act to authorize appropriations under the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other purposes;

S. 818. An act to authorize appropriations for activities under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974; and

S. 1195. An act to require that a portion of the mail of Congress and the executive branch include a photograph and biography of a missing child.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 63. An act to encourage the rendering of in-flight emergency care aboard aircraft by requiring the placement of emergency first aid medical supplies and equipment aboard aircraft and by relieving appropriate persons of liability for the provision and use of such equipment and supplies;

S. 974. An act to provide for protection and advocacy for mentally ill persons;

S. 1106. An act to provide for the use and distribution of funds appropriated in satisfaction of judgments awarded to the Saginaw Chippewa Tribe of Michigan in dockets numbered 57, 59, and 13E of the Indian Claims Commission and docket numbered 13F of the U.S. Claims Court, and for other purposes;

S. 1349. An act to provide for the use and distribution of funds awarded in docket 363 to the Mdewakanton and Wahpekute Eastern or Mississippi Sioux before the U.S. Court of Claims and Claims Court;

S. 1515. An act to authorize a partial transfer of the authority of the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority to the States of Maine and New Hampshire; and

S. 1529. An act to authorize appropriations for State and community highway safety grants, and for other purposes.

REV. ROBERT A. RUSBULT

(Mr. CAMPBELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me this morning in welcoming Rev. Robert A. Rusbuldt, senior pastor of the Emmanuel Baptist Church in Penn Yan, NY.

Reverend Rusbuldt has pastored churches in New York and New Jersey, and he is currently completing his 30th year in the ministry. Under his leadership, new church buildings have been erected, programs for the elderly, needy, and youth have been established, and many people have gained new confidence and direction in their lives through his ministry and several radio programs.

Throughout his distinguished service, Reverend Rusbuldt has served as president of the Eastern New York Bible Conference, president of the Finger Lakes Pastor's Fellowship, and a member of the board of directors of the Mid-State Baptist Youth Camp.

He has always provided special attention to our young people, giving leadership to an excellent school at

Emmanuel Baptist Academy. Moreover, he has worked tirelessly to improve and enhance the spiritual, physical, and intellectual needs of our youth. I know he brings to his church, community, and spiritual mission a special dedication, understanding, and vigor that is an inspiration to all.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Reverend Rusbuldt through his son, and my former legislative director, Bob Rusbuldt. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to have Reverend Rusbuldt as our guest chaplain today.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1714, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1986

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1714) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control and data communications, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire as to whether this has been cleared with the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN]?

Mr. FUQUA. If the gentleman will yield, it has been cleared with the ranking minority member.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FUQUA, BROWN of California, NELSON of Florida, ANDREWS, TORRICELLI, LUJAN, WALKER, and LEWIS of Florida.

AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by President Reagan that he would agree to an immediate removal of Social Security from the unified budget is startling, yet welcome, news.

The House should "call and raise" him by agreeing to split the budget and also passing a bill which I and 62 other Members, have introduced, H.R. 825, making Social Security an independent agency. While the unified

budget and an independent agency for Social Security are two separate issues, they are intertwined and it should naturally follow that if Social Security is made an independent agency, then it should be removed from the unified budget.

The Social Security Subcommittee, chaired by the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. JONES, held hearings earlier this year on both issues and has indicated that he will pursue the matter.

Mr. Speaker, making Social Security an independent agency will remove Social Security from politics as much as possible. Whether we have a board or commission, there is always an element of politics depending upon who is President, but we can minimize the influence of politics and restore the confidence of the people in the system by creating an independent agency.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may have been surprised by what the President has proposed. But we should proceed with all due speed, accept the President's offer to remove Social Security from the unified budget and go him one better by also making it an independent agency.

THE DANGERS OF AN OUT-OF-CONTROL NATIONAL DEBT

(Mr. SENSENBRENNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, "A national debt, if it is not excessive, will be to us a national blessing." This statement, Mr. Speaker, was made in a letter to Robert Morris by Alexander Hamilton, the founder of our financial system. Secretary Hamilton realized the dangers an out-of-control national debt would hold for our young Nation. Today, our debt grows daily. When the Congress returns in September, one of our first tasks will be to raise the debt ceiling over the \$2 trillion mark.

The collapse of the budget process, mounting deficits, and the failure of any significant movement toward a balanced budget compelled me to become a member of CLUBB—Congressional Leaders United for a Balanced Budget. CLUBB was founded in October 1983, as a bipartisan, bicameral coalition to coordinate Senate, House, and State forces working to enact the balanced budget/tax limitation amendment.

Article V of the Constitution provides a method for States to call a constitutional convention if two-thirds of the States call for a convention. Thirty-two States, two short of the required number of States, have called for a constitutional convention and more State legislatures are planning to debate and perhaps pass additional

resolutions calling for a convention. The Senate Judiciary Committee recently approved legislation establishing procedures for holding a constitutional convention.

As the ranking Republican member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, I welcome the opportunity to explore the need for establishing procedures for a constitutional convention, thereby negating the concern over a "runaway convention."

Justice John Marshall endorsed the concept of constitutional change when he wrote in 1821, "The people made the Constitution and the people can unmake it. It is the creature of their own will, and lives only by their will."

Mr. Speaker, Chief Justice Marshall recognized the Constitution as a living, breathing document, one that could be changed if the circumstances required it. I believe change is warranted because of the historic and debilitating deficits we are now incurring. The danger of fiscal collapse is ever present. It is my belief a constitutional mandate is needed to force both the Congress and the Executive to come to grips with the deficit, and the cost of the deficit's interest payments.

The Business Roundtable estimated the Federal debt currently totals approximately \$8,750 for every adult in the Nation. The interest alone on that debt will cost about \$980 for every tax-paying American this year. I urge Members of this House and all legislative bodies to join together to amend the Constitution either through the traditional method in which the last 25 amendments have been approved or through the legislative mechanism established by our Founding Fathers in article V of our Constitution.

□ 1030

REPRESSION IS WIDESPREAD

(Mr. FOGLIETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, human rights are very much in the national consciousness right now. The state of emergency in South Africa has made us once more realize that the basic freedoms we enjoy here are not widespread. Unfortunately, repression is widespread—even among those we call our allies.

In South Korea, the government of Chun Doo Hwan has once more demonstrated its determination to silence democratic voices of opposition to its policies. Kim Dae Jung, South Korea's most passionate advocate of democratic rights, is again under house arrest. Having returned to South Korea from his exile in the United States to carry on the peaceful struggle for democracy, Kim has found himself frozen out,

his rights subject to the whims of the Chun government.

Kim has been placed under house arrest to prevent him from attending the national convention of the New Korea Democratic Party. Instead of being allowed to attend as a simple delegate and leader, and thus giving credibility to the Chun government's claims of belief in human rights, he has been banned. His arrest has given the opposition all the proof it needs that Chun will never allow democracy, and made a mockery of the promises of a truly free South Korea made by Chun in his state visit earlier this year.

The United States should protest loudly Kim's arrest, and demand his release. To do any less undermines our protests of injustice elsewhere in the world, and gives tacit approval to actions which cannot be justified.

The Chun government should release Kim Dae Jung.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1460, ANTI-APARTHEID ACT OF 1985

Mr. FASCELL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1460) to express the opposition of the United States to the system of apartheid in South Africa, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 242)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1460) to express the opposition of the United States to the system of apartheid in South Africa, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Anti-Apartheid Action Act of 1985."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the policy and practices of apartheid—
(A) deliberately separates millions of South African "migrant" workers from their families;

(B) denies meaningful, democratic participation in the political process to the majority of the South African population;

(C) consigns the mass South African citizenry to lives of economic and educational deprivation;

(D) denies black citizens of South Africa the right to travel freely within their own country;

(E) leads to the arbitrary government confiscation of the private property legally owned by black South African nationals; and

(F) tries to deprive many South African citizens of South African citizenship;

(2) the policy and practice of apartheid is repugnant to the moral and political values

of democratic and free societies, and runs counter to United States policies to promote democratic governments throughout the world and respect for human rights; and

(3) it is the policy of the United States to promote peaceful change in South Africa through diplomatic means, but also, where necessary and appropriate, through the adoption of other measures, in conjunction with our allies, in order to reinforce United States opposition to apartheid.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "national of the United States" means—

(A) a natural person who is a citizen of the United States or who owes permanent allegiance to the United States; or

(B) a corporation, partnership, or other enterprise if—

(i) natural persons who are nationals of the United States own or control, directly or indirectly, more than 50 percent of the outstanding voting securities;

(ii) natural persons who are nationals of the United States own or control, directly or indirectly 25 percent or more of the voting securities, and natural persons of another nationality do not own or control an equal or larger percentage;

(iii) any natural person who is a national of the United States operates the corporation, partnership, or enterprise pursuant to the provisions of an exclusive management contract;

(iv) a majority of the members of the board of directors are also members of the comparable governing body of a corporation or legal entity organized under the laws of the United States, any State or territory thereof, or the District of Columbia; or

(v) natural persons who are nationals of the United States have authority to appoint the chief operating officer;

(2) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of State; and

(3) the term "South Africa" refers to the territory that constituted the Republic of South Africa on May 31, 1961.

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR BLACK SOUTH AFRICANS

SEC. 4. Section 105(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(b)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2)(A) Of the assistance provided under this section by the Administrator of the agency primarily responsible for administering this part of this Act—

"(i) for the fiscal year 1986, \$8,000,000;

"(ii) for the fiscal year 1987, \$11,000,000; and

"(iii) for the fiscal year 1988 and each fiscal year thereafter, \$15,000,000,

shall be used to finance education, training, and scholarships for black South Africans who are attending universities, colleges, and secondary schools in South Africa and who are selected in accordance with subparagraph (B). Of the funds available under the preceding sentence to carry out this subparagraph, not less than one-third shall be available only for assistance to full-time teachers or other educational professionals pursuing studies toward the improvement of their professional credentials.

"(B) Of the funds provided in subparagraph (A) for each fiscal year, 50 percent shall be available for educational assistance for black South Africans in accordance with section 802(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985.

The remainder of the funds in each fiscal year which are not made available under the preceding sentence shall be available to finance scholarships for individuals selected by a nationwide panel or by regional panels composed solely of members of the teaching profession appointed by the United States chief of diplomatic mission to South Africa. No such individual may be selected through any contract entered into with the agency primarily responsible for administering this part of this Act."

HUMAN RIGHTS FUND

SEC. 5. (a) Section 116(e)(2)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by striking out "1984 and" and inserting in lieu thereof "1984,"; and

(2) by inserting after "1985" a comma and the following: "and \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year 1986 and for each fiscal year thereafter".

(b) Section 116 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Of the funds made available to carry out subsection (e)(2)(A) for each fiscal year, \$350,000 shall be used for direct legal and other assistance to political detainees and prisoners and their families, including the investigation of the killing of protesters and prisoners, and for support for actions of black-led community organizations to resist, through nonviolent means, the enforcement of apartheid policies such as—

"(1) removal of black populations from certain geographic areas on account of race or ethnic origin,

"(2) denationalization of blacks, including any distinctions between the South African citizenships of blacks and whites,

"(3) residence restrictions based on race or ethnic origin,

"(4) restrictions on the rights of blacks to seek employment in South Africa and live wherever they find employment in South Africa, and

"(5) restrictions which make it impossible for black employees and their families to be housed in family accommodations near their place of employment."

EXPANDING PARTICIPATION IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN ECONOMY

SEC. 6. (a) The Congress declares that—

(1) the denial under the apartheid laws of South Africa of the rights of South African blacks and other nonwhites to have the opportunity to participate equitably in the South African economy as managers or owners of, or professionals in, business enterprises, and

(2) the policy of confining South African blacks and other nonwhites to the status of employees in minority-dominated businesses,

is an affront to the values of a free society.

(b) The Congress hereby—

(1) applauds the commitment of nationals of the United States adhering to the principles set forth in section 10 to assure that South African blacks and other nonwhites are given assistance in gaining their rightful place in the South African economy; and

(2) urges the United States Government to assist in all appropriate ways the realization by South African blacks and other nonwhites of their rightful place in the South African economy.

(c) The Secretary of State and any other head of a department or agency of the United States carrying out activities in South Africa shall, to the maximum extent practicable, in procuring goods or services, make affirmative efforts to assist business

enterprises having more than 50 percent beneficial ownership by South African blacks or other nonwhite South Africans.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 7. Section 2(b)(9) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended—

(1) by striking out "(9) In" and inserting in lieu thereof "(9)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(B) The Bank shall take active steps to encourage the use of its facilities to guarantee, insure, extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit to business enterprises in South Africa that are majority owned by South African blacks or other nonwhite South Africans. The certification requirement contained in clause (c) of subparagraph (A) shall not apply to exports to or purchases from business enterprises which are majority owned by South African blacks or other nonwhite South Africans."

LABOR PRACTICES OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

SEC. 8. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that the labor practices used by the United States Government—

(1) for the direct hire of South Africans,

(2) for the reimbursement out of official residence funds of South Africans and employees of South African organizations for their long-term employment services on behalf of the United States Government, and

(3) for the employment services of South Africans arranged by contract,

should represent the best of labor practices in the United States and should serve as a model for the labor practices of nationals of the United States in South Africa.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State and any other head of a department or agency of the United States carrying out activities in South Africa shall promptly take the necessary steps to ensure that the labor practices applied to the employment services described in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (a) are governed by the principles set forth in section 10(a).

EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES OF UNITED STATES NATIONALS IN SOUTH AFRICA

SEC. 9. (a) Any national of the United States that employs more than 25 persons in South Africa shall take the necessary steps to ensure that those principles relating to employment practices set forth in section 10(a) are implemented.

(b) No department or agency of the United States may intercede with any foreign government or any national regarding the export marketing activities in any country of any national of the United States employing more than 25 persons in South Africa that is not implementing the principles relating to employment practices in South Africa set forth in section 10(a).

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

SEC. 10. (a) The principles referred to in sections 8 and 9 of this Act are as follows:

(1) Desegregating the races in each employment facility, including—

(A) removing all race designation signs;

(B) desegregating all eating, rest, and work facilities; and

(C) terminating all regulations which are based on racial discrimination.

(2) Providing equal employment for all employees without regard to race or ethnic origin, including—

(A) assuring that any health, accident, or death benefit plans that are established are

nondiscriminatory and open to all employees without regard to race or ethnic origin; and

(B)(i) implementing equal and nondiscriminatory terms and conditions of employment for all employees, and (ii) abolishing job reservations, job fragmentation, apprenticeship restrictions for blacks and other nonwhites, and differential employment criteria, which discriminate on the basis of race or ethnic origin.

(3) Assuring that the pay system is equitably applied to all employees without regard to race or ethnic origin, including—

(A) assuring that any wage and salary structure that is implemented is applied equally to all employees without regard to race or ethnic origin;

(B) eliminating any distinctions between hourly and salaried job classifications on the basis of race or ethnic origin; and

(C) eliminating any inequities in seniority and in-grade benefits which are based on race or ethnic origin.

(4) Establishing a minimum wage and salary structure based on the appropriate local minimum economic level which takes into account the needs of employees and their families.

(5) Increasing, by appropriate means, the number of blacks and other nonwhites in managerial, supervisory, administrative, clerical, and technical jobs for the purpose of significantly increasing the representation of blacks and other nonwhites in such jobs, including—

(A) developing training programs that will prepare substantial numbers of blacks and other nonwhites for such jobs as soon as possible, including—

(i) expanding existing programs and forming new programs to train, upgrade, and improve the skills of all categories of employees, including establishing and expanding programs to enable employees to further their education and skills at recognized education facilities; and

(ii) creating on-the-job training programs and facilities to assist employees to advance to higher paying jobs requiring greater skills;

(B) establishing procedures to assess, identify, and actively recruit employees with potential for further advancement;

(C) identifying blacks and other nonwhites with high management potential and enrolling them in accelerated management programs; and

(D) establishing timetables to carry out this paragraph.

(6) Taking reasonable steps to improve the quality of employees' lives outside the work environment with respect to housing, transportation, schooling, recreation, and health, including—

(A) providing assistance to black and other nonwhite employees for housing, health care, transportation, and recreation either through the provision of facilities or services or providing financial assistance to employees for such purposes, including the expansion or creation of in-house medical facilities or other medical programs to improve medical care for black and other nonwhite employees and their dependents; and

(B) participating in the development of programs that address the education needs of employees, their dependents, and the local community.

(7) Implementing fair labor practices, including—

(A) recognizing the right of all employees, regardless of racial or other distinctions, to self-organization and to form, join, or assist

labor organizations, freely and without penalty or reprisal, and recognizing the right to refrain from any such activity;

(B) refraining from—

(i) interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of their rights of self-organization under this paragraph,

(ii) dominating or interfering with the formation or administration of any labor organization or sponsoring, controlling, or contributing financial or other assistance to it, except that any employer may permit employees to confer with the employer during working hours without loss of time or pay,

(iii) encouraging or discouraging membership in any labor organization by discrimination in regard to hiring, tenure, promotion, or other condition of employment,

(iv) discharging or otherwise disciplining or discriminating against any employee who has exercised any rights of self-organization under this paragraph, and

(v) refusing to bargain collectively with any organization freely chosen by employees under this paragraph; and

(C)(1) allowing employees to exercise rights of self-organization, including solicitation of fellow employees during nonworking hours, (ii) allowing distribution and posting of union literature by employees during nonworking hours in nonworking areas, and (iii) allowing reasonable access to labor organization representatives to communicate with employees on employer premises at reasonable times where there are no other available channels which will enable the labor organization to communicate with employees through reasonable efforts.

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that in addition to the principles enumerated in subsection (a), nationals of the United States subject to section 9 should seek to comply with the following principle: taking reasonable measures to extend the scope of influence on activities outside the workplace, including—

(1) supporting the unrestricted rights of black businesses to locate in urban areas;

(2) influencing other companies in South Africa to follow the standards of equal rights principles;

(3) supporting the freedom of mobility of black workers to seek employment opportunities wherever they exist, and making provision for adequate housing for families of employees within the proximity of workers' employment; and

(4) supporting the rescission of all apartheid laws.

(c) The Secretary may issue guidelines and criteria to assist persons who are or may be subject to section 9 in complying with the principles set forth in subsection (a) of this section. The Secretary may, upon request, give an advisory opinion to any person who is or may be subject to this section as to whether that person is subject to this section or would be considered to be in compliance with the principles set forth in subsection (a).

(d) The Secretary may require all nationals of the United States referred to in section 9 to register with the Department of State.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may, to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts, enter into contracts with one or more private organizations or individuals to assist the Secretary in implementing this section.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 11. (a) The Secretary shall establish an Advisory Committee—

(1) to advise the Secretary with respect to the implementation of those principles set forth in section 10(a), and

(2) to review periodically the reports submitted pursuant to section 12(a) and, where necessary, to supplement the information contained in such reports.

The Advisory Committee shall be composed of at least 12 members appointed by the Secretary from among persons in the United States and South Africa representing trade unions committed to nondiscriminatory policies, representatives of business (including the American Chamber of Commerce in South Africa), and the academic community, and from among community and church leaders, including those in South Africa, who have demonstrated a concern for equal rights. In addition to the appointed members of the Advisory Committee, the United States Ambassador to South Africa shall be a member of the Advisory Committee, ex officio. The Committee shall be authorized to meet in the United States Embassy in South Africa or such other location as the Secretary may designate.

(b) Members of the Advisory Committee shall be appointed for 3-year terms, except that of the members first appointed, four shall be appointed for terms of two years, and four shall be appointed for terms of one year, as designated at the time of their appointment. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the predecessor of such member was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

(c) The Secretary shall provide the necessary clerical and administrative assistance to the Advisory Committee.

(d) Members of the Advisory Committee shall serve without pay, except that, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Committee, members of the Advisory Committee shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

IMPLEMENTATION

SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Congress describing—

(1) the extent to which each national of the United States referred to in section 9 has implemented each of the principles set forth in section 10(a);

(2) the progress each national of the United States referred to in section 9 has made since the previous annual report in implementing each of those principles;

(3) the actions the Secretary has taken to encourage implementation of those principles, by nationals of the United States as well as any person who is not a national of the United States and who employs at least 25 individuals in South Africa, as well as any related actions taken by other departments or agencies of the United States Government;

(4) any other information that the Secretary believes is appropriate relating to the implementation of those principles by nationals of the United States as well as any person who is not a national of the United States and who employs at least 25 individuals in South Africa;

(5) in the first five annual reports issued pursuant to this subsection, the extent to which each of the 100 largest foreign investors in South Africa who are not nationals of the United States have implemented the principles set forth in section 10(a);

(6) in the sixth and subsequent annual reports issued pursuant to this subsection, the extent to which each of the 200 largest foreign investors in South Africa who are not nationals of the United States have implemented the principles set forth in section 10(a); and

(7) recommendations by the Secretary for action which the Congress or the President could take to encourage implementation of those principles by persons who are not nationals of the United States and who employ at least 25 individuals in South Africa, including an analysis of the extent to which the imposition of restraints on imports into the United States from such persons would encourage implementation of those principles.

(b) The Secretary shall publish and make generally available to the public each annual report submitted pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) The Secretary may, to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts, enter into contracts with one or more private organizations to assist the Secretary in preparing the report required by subsection (a).

(d) Each national of the United States referred to in section 9 of this act shall submit directly to the Secretary, or through an organization with which the Secretary has a contract under subsection (c)—

(1) detailed and fully documented annual report on the progress of that person in implementing the principles set forth in section 10(a); and

(2) such other information relating to implementation of the principles set forth in section 10(a) as the Secretary shall be regulation direct.

The reports and information required by this subsection shall be submitted at such times as the Secretary shall by regulation require.

(e) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to the Department of State to carry out the provisions of this section. The Secretary may establish an office to carry out such provisions.

(f) Upon the request of any national of the United States subject to the provisions of this section and section 10 which is made within 60 days after the publication of the Secretary's report pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary shall afford an opportunity for a hearing, within 90 days after such publication, in which such person may comment on the contents of such report.

(g)(1) The Secretary shall make available to the Advisory Committee established pursuant to section 11, and may make available to the public, information obtained pursuant to subsection (d) that relates to the employment practices of nationals of the United States subject to section 9 with respect to blacks and other nonwhite employees.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall not make available to the Advisory Committee or disclose to the public any information that would harm the competitive position or the proprietary interests, or would reveal trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information, of any national of the United States required to submit reports under subsection (d), as defined under regulations of the Secretary.

(h) The Secretary shall make all reasonable efforts to verify the information submit-

ted under subsection (d), including the establishment of arrangements with nationals of the United States subject to section 9 for onsite monitoring, at least once every two years, of their activities and facilities in South Africa.

(i) The Secretary shall make reasonable and continuing efforts to promote the implementation of sections 9 and 10 and any regulations issued to carry out those sections.

NUCLEAR TRADE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND SOUTH AFRICA

SEC. 13. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) and notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) no license may be issued for the export to South Africa of goods or technology which are to be used in a nuclear production or utilization facility, or which, in the judgment of the Secretary of State, are likely to be diverted for use in such a facility;

(2) no authorization to engage, directly or indirectly, in the production of any special nuclear material in South Africa may be given;

(3) no license may be issued for the export to South Africa of component parts or other items or substances especially relevant from the standpoint of export control because of their significance for nuclear explosive purposes; and

(4) no retransfer to South Africa of any goods, technology, special nuclear material, components, items or substances described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) may be approved.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of State determines and certifies to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that the Government of South Africa is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Washington, London, and Moscow on July 1, 1968.

EXPORTS TO SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT

SEC. 14. (a) No computers, computer software, or goods or technology intended to service computers may be exported, directly or indirectly, to or for use by any of the following entities of the Government of South Africa:

- (1) The military.
- (2) The police.
- (3) The prison system.
- (4) The national security agencies.
- (5) ARMSCOR and its subsidiaries or the weapons research activities of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research.
- (6) The administering authorities for the black passbook and the book of life systems.
- (7) Any other entity which implements restrictions on where nonwhites are permitted to live or work.
- (8) Any other entity that administers programs which directly discriminate against nonwhites.
- (9) Any local, regional, or homelands government entity which performs any function of any entity described in paragraphs (1) through (8).

(b) Computers, computer software, and goods or technology intended to service computers may be exported, directly or indirectly, to or for use by an entity of the Government of South Africa other than those set forth in subsection (a) only if—

- (1) the services provided by the entity will benefit nonwhites, or both whites and nonwhites; and
- (2) a system of end use verification is in effect to ensure that the computers involved

will not be used for any function of any entity set forth in subsection (a).

The restriction set forth in paragraph (1) shall apply only to exports with a contract value of \$100,000 or greater. The President may waive such restriction if he determines that a computer sale to an entity which serves whites only is necessary for humanitarian purposes.

(c) The President shall provide a detailed report to the Congress 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter on the implementation of the requirements set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b).

(d) For purposes of this section, the term "computer" includes any computer that is the direct product of technology of United States origin.

PROHIBITION ON LOANS TO THE SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT

SEC. 15. (a) No national of the United States may make any loan or other extension of credit, directly or through a foreign affiliate of that national of the United States, to the Government of South Africa or to any corporation, partnership or other organization which is owned or controlled by the Government of South Africa, as determined under regulations which the President shall issue.

(b) The prohibition contained in subsection (a) shall not apply to—

(1) a loan or extension of credit for any educational, housing, or health facility which—

(A) is available to all persons on a nondiscriminatory basis; and

(B) is located in a geographic area accessible to all population groups without any legal or administrative restriction; or

(2) a loan or extension of credit for which an agreement is entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) The President shall issue the regulations referred to in subsection (a) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

REPORT AND POLICY ON ECONOMIC SANCTIONS

SEC. 16. (a) It shall be the policy of the United States to impose economic sanctions against the Government of South Africa if, within 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, but not later than January 1, 1987, significant progress has not been made toward ending the policy of apartheid.

(b) The President shall, by means of both bilateral and multilateral negotiations with other nations, develop appropriate multilateral economic sanctions against the Government of South Africa. Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and at intervals of 12 months thereafter, the President shall submit to the Congress a report on the status of such negotiations. Each such report shall contain a detailed assessment of exports to South Africa from other countries of computers and other technology the export of which from the United States is prohibited under section 13 or 14 on this Act.

(c) The President shall prepare and transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate within 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, but not later than January 1, 1987, and every 12 months thereafter, a report on the extent to which significant progress has been made toward ending the system of apartheid, including—

(1) a detailed assessment of the extent to which the Government of South Africa has

made significant progress towards meeting the following conditions:

(A) Eliminating the system which makes it impossible for black employees and their families to be housed in family accommodations near the place of employment;

(B) Eliminating all policies that restrict the rights of black people to seek employment in South Africa and to live wherever they find employment in South Africa;

(C) Eliminating all policies that make distinctions between the South African nationality of blacks and whites;

(D) Eliminating removals of black populations from certain geographic areas on account of race or ethnic origin;

(E) Eliminating all residence restrictions based on race or ethnic origin;

(F) Entering into meaningful negotiations with truly representative leaders of the black population for a new political system providing for the full national participation of all the people of South Africa in the social, political, and economic life in that country and an end to discrimination based on race or ethnic origin;

(G) Achieving an internationally recognized settlement for Namibia; and

(H) Freeing all political prisoners;

(2) a determination by the President as to whether significant progress has been made in meeting the conditions described in clauses (A) through (H) of paragraph (1); and

(3) if the President determines under paragraph (2) that significant progress has not been made, a recommendation as to which of the following sanctions should be imposed:

(A) A ban on new commercial investment in South Africa.

(B) A denial of most-favored-nation status to South Africa.

(C) A ban on the importation of coal, uranium ore, and uranium oxide from South Africa and Namibia.

(D) Other economic or political sanctions.

(d)(1) Any joint resolution which—

(A) would enact part or all of the sanctions described in clauses (A) through (D) of subsection (c)(3), and

(B) is introduced in the Senate after the date of receipt of the report required by subsection (c),

shall be considered in the Senate in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976, except that, for purposes of section 601(b)(3)(A) of such Act, a reference to the "same certification" shall be deemed to be a reference to the report required by subsection (c).

(2) A joint resolution which is described in paragraph (1) and which is introduced in the House of Representatives after the date of receipt of the report required by subsection (c) shall be considered in accordance with paragraphs (1) through (5) of section 17(e).

PROHIBITION ON THE IMPORTATION OF KRUGERRANDS; WAIVER AUTHORITY

SEC. 17. (a) No person, including a bank, may import into the United States any South African Krugerrand or any other gold coin minted in South Africa or offered for sale by the Government of South Africa.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "United States" includes the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

(c)(1) The President may waive the prohibition contained in subsection (a) for a period of not more than 12 months if—

(A) the President determines that one or more of the conditions set forth in subsection (d) are met,

(B) the President submits that determination to the Congress, and

(C) a joint resolution is enacted approving the President's determination.

(2) The President may waive the prohibitions contained in subsection (a) for additional 6-month periods if, before each such waiver—

(A) the President determines that an additional condition set forth in subsection (d) has been met since the preceding waiver under this subsection became effective,

(B) the President submits that determination to the Congress, and

(C) a joint resolution is enacted approving the President's determination.

(d) The conditions referred to in subsection (c) are the following:

(1) The Government of South Africa has eliminated the system which makes it impossible for black employees and their families to be housed in family accommodations near the place of employment.

(2) The Government of South Africa has eliminated all policies that restrict the rights of black people to seek employment in South Africa and to live wherever they find employment in South Africa.

(3) The Government of South Africa has eliminated all policies that make distinctions between the South African nationality of blacks and whites.

(4) The Government of South Africa has eliminated removals of black populations from certain geographic areas on account of race or ethnic origin.

(5) The Government of South Africa has eliminated all residence restrictions based on race or ethnic origin.

(6) The Government of South Africa has entered into meaningful negotiations with truly representative leaders of the black population for a new political system providing for the full national participation of all the people of South Africa in the social, political, and economic life in that country and an end to discrimination based on race or ethnic origin.

(7) An internationally recognized settlement for Namibia has been achieved.

(8) The Government of South Africa has freed all political prisoners.

(e)(1) All joint resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives and the Senate shall be referred immediately to the appropriate committees.

(2) If the committee of either House to which a joint resolution has been referred has not reported it at the end of 30 days after its introduction, the committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution or of any other joint resolution introduced with respect to the same matter.

(3) A joint resolution under this subsection shall be considered in the Senate in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b)(4) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976. For the purpose of expediting the consideration and passage of joint resolutions reported or discharged pursuant to the provisions of this subsection, it shall be in order for the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives to present for consideration a resolution of the House of Representatives providing procedures for the immediate consideration of a joint resolution

under this subsection which may be similar, if applicable, to the procedures set forth in section 601(b)(4) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976.

(4) If before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House, that House receives a joint resolution with respect to the same matter from the other House, then—

(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

(5) In the computation of the period of 30 days referred to in paragraph (2) there shall be excluded the days on which either House of Congress is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain or because of an adjournment of the Congress sine die.

(6) For purposes of this subsection, the term "joint resolution" means a joint resolution the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the Congress, having received on a determination of the President under section 17(c) of the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985, approves the President's determination.", with the date of the receipt of the determination inserted in the blank.

MINTING GOLD BULLION COINS

SEC. 18. (a) Section 5112(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(7) A fifty dollar gold coin that is 32.7 millimeters in diameter, weighs 33.931 grams, and contains one troy ounce of fine gold.

"(8) A twenty-five dollar gold coin that is 27.0 millimeters in diameter, weighs 16.966 grams, and contains one-half troy ounce of fine gold.

"(9) A ten dollar gold coin that is 22.0 millimeters in diameter, weighs 8.483 grams, and contains one-fourth troy ounce of fine gold.

"(10) A five dollar gold coin that is 16.5 millimeters in diameter, weighs 3.393 grams, and contains one-tenth troy ounce of fine gold."

(b) Section 5112 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i)(1) Notwithstanding section 5112(a)(1) of this title, the Secretary shall mint and issue the gold coins described in paragraphs (7), (8), (9), and (10) of subsection (a) of this section, in quantities sufficient to meet public demand, and such gold coins shall—

"(A) have a design determined by the Secretary, except that the fifty dollar gold coin shall have—

"(i) on the obverse side, a design symbolic of Liberty; and

"(ii) on the reverse side, a design representing a family of eagles, with the male carrying an olive branch and flying above a nest containing a female eagle and hatchlings;

"(B) have inscriptions of the denomination, the weight of the fine gold content, the year of minting or issuance, and the words 'Liberty', 'In God We Trust', 'United States of America', and 'E Pluribus Unum'; and

"(C) have reeded edges.

"(2)(A) The Secretary shall sell the coins minted under this subsection to the public at a price equal to the market value of the bullion at the time of sale, plus the cost of minting, marketing, and distributing such coins (including labor, materials, dies, use

of machinery, and promotional and overhead expenses).

"(B) The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins minted under this subsection at a reasonable discount.

"(3) For purposes of section 5132(a)(1) of this title, all coins minted under this subsection shall be considered to be numismatic items."

"(c) Section 5116(a)(2) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall acquire the gold for the coins issued under section 5112(i) of this title by purchase only from natural deposits in the United States or in a territory or possession of the United States, or from reserves of gold held by the United States."

"(d) Section 5118(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking out "or deliver"; and

(2) in the second sentence, by inserting "(other than gold and silver coins)" before "that may be lawfully held".

(e) The third sentence of section 5132(a)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking out "minted under section 5112(a) of this title" and inserting in lieu thereof "minted under paragraphs (1) through (6) of section 5112(a) of this title".

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an amount equal to the amount by which the proceeds from the sale of the coins issued under section 5112(i) of title 31, United States Code, exceed the sum of—

(1) the cost of minting, marketing, and distributing such coins, and

(2) the value of gold certificates (not exceeding forty-two and two-ninths dollars a fine troy ounce) retired from the use of gold contained in such coins,

shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury and shall be used for the sole purpose of reducing the national debt.

"(g) The Secretary shall take all actions necessary to ensure that the issuance of the coins minted under section 5112(i) of title 31, United States Code, shall result in no net cost to the United States Government.

(h) This section shall take effect on October 1, 1985, except that no coins may be issued or sold under section 5112(i) of title 31, United States Code, before October 1, 1986.

STUDY OF HEALTH CONDITIONS IN THE "HOMELANDS" AREAS OF SOUTH AFRICA

SEC. 19. The Secretary of State shall conduct a study to examine the state of health conditions and to determine the extent of starvation and malnutrition now prevalent in the "homelands" areas of South Africa and shall, not later than December 1, 1985, prepare and transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report setting forth the results of such study.

REGULATORY AUTHORITY

SEC. 20. (a) The President shall issue such regulations, licenses, and orders as are necessary to carry out—

(1) the provisions of section 14 prohibiting certain exports to South African Government entities;

(2) the provisions of section 15 prohibiting loans to South African Government entities; and

(3) the provisions of section 17 prohibiting the importation of Krugerrands.

(b)(1) The Secretary shall issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out—

(A) the provisions of section 9;
 (B) the provisions of section 10(d), relating to registration; and
 (C) the provisions of section 12(d) requiring the submission of reports.

(2) The regulations of the Secretary first issued under paragraph (1) shall be issued not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) Before issuing final regulations under this section, the President and the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the regulations proposed to be issued and shall give interested persons, including the Advisory Committee established pursuant to section 11, at least 30 days to submit comments on the proposed regulations. The President and the Secretary shall, in issuing the final regulations, take into account the comments so submitted.

(d) The first annual report of the Secretary under section 12(a) shall be submitted to the Congress not later than one year after the date on which final regulations issued under subsection (b)(2) of this section are published. Each subsequent annual report shall be submitted not later than the end of each 1-year period thereafter.

ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

SEC. 21. (a) The President with respect to his authorities under section 20(a), and the Secretary with respect to his authorities under section 20(b), shall take the necessary steps to ensure compliance with the provisions of this Act and any regulations, licenses, and orders issued to carry out this Act, including establishing mechanisms to monitor compliance with this Act and such regulations, licenses, and orders. In ensuring such compliance, the President and the Secretary may conduct investigations, hold hearings, administer oaths, examine witnesses, receive evidence, take depositions, and require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all books, papers and documents relating to any matter under investigation.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (d)—
 (1) any person, other than an individual, that violates the provisions of this Act, or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out this Act shall be fined not more than \$1,000,000;

(2) any individual who violates the provisions of this Act or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out this Act shall be fined not more than \$50,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both; and

(3) any individual who violates section 17(a) or any regulations issued to carry out that section shall, instead of the penalty set forth in paragraph (2), be fined not more than 5 times the value the krugerrands or gold coins involved.

(c)(1) Whenever a person commits a violation under subsection (b)—

(A) any officer, director, or employee of such person, or any natural person in control of such person who knowingly and willfully ordered, authorized, acquiesced in, or carried out the act or practice constituting the violation, and

(B) any agent of such person who knowingly and willfully carried out such act or practice, shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the case of a violation by an individual of section 17(a) or of any regulation issued to carry out that section.

(3) A fine imposed under paragraph (1) on an individual for an act or practice constituting a violation may not be paid, directly

or indirectly, by the person committing the violation itself.

(d)(1) Any person who violates any regulation issued under section 10(d) or 12(d) or who, in a registration statement or report required by the Secretary, makes any untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state a material fact required to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements therein not misleading, shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$10,000 imposed by the Secretary. The provisions of subsections (d), (e), and (f) of section 11 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 shall apply with respect to any such civil penalty.

(2) Any person who commits a willful violation under paragraph (1) shall upon conviction be fined not more than \$1,000,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

(3) Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize the imposition of any penalty for failure to implement the principles set forth in section 10(a).

TERMINATION OF PROVISIONS OF ACT

SEC. 22. (a) If the President determines that the system of apartheid in South Africa has been abolished, the President may submit that determination, and the basis for the determination, to the Congress.

(b) Upon the enactment of a joint resolution approving a determination of the President submitted to the Congress under subsection (a), the provisions of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and all regulations, licenses, and orders issued to carry out this Act, shall terminate.

(c) For purposes of subsection (a), the "abolition of apartheid" shall include—

(1) the repeal of all laws and regulations that discriminate on the basis of race; and

(2) the establishment of a body of laws that assures the full national participation of all the people of South Africa in the social, political, and economic life in that country.

APPLICABILITY TO EVASIONS OF ACT

SEC. 23. This Act and the regulations issued to carry out this Act shall apply to any person who undertakes or causes to be undertaken any transaction or activity with the intent to evade this Act or such regulations.

CONSTRUCTION OF ACT

SEC. 24. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as constituting any recognition by the United States of the homelands referred to in this Act.

And the Senate agree to the same.

From the Foreign Affairs Committee on all provisions (except section 17 of the Senate amendment) and modifications committed to conference:

DANTE B. FASCELL,
 STEPHEN J. SOLARZ,
 DON BONKER,
 HOWARD WOLPE,
 GEO. W. CROCKETT, Jr.,
 MERVYN M. DYMALLY,
 HOWARD BERMAN,
 TED WEISS,
 ROBERT GARCIA,
 WM. BROOMFIELD,
 MIKE DEWINE,

From the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee for section 17 of the Senate amendment and modifications committed to conference as additional conferees for the following sections: Section 3; section 4; section 5; sections 14(6) and 14(7) of the House bill; and section 8; section 15 of the Senate amendment:

FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
 HENRY GONZALEZ,

FRANK ANNUNZIO,
 PARREN J. MITCHELL,
 STEPHEN L. NEAL,
 DOUG BARNARD, Jr.,
 BRUCE A. MORRISON,
 CHALMERS P. WYLLIE,
 STEWART B. MCKINNEY,
 JIM LEACH,
 JOHN HILER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD G. LUGAR,
 CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS,
 Jr.,
 NANCY LANDON
 KASSEBAUM,
 JOHN HEINZ,
 CLAIBORNE PELL,
 PAUL SARBANES,
 ALAN CRANSTON,
 BILL PROXMIER,

For section 15 of the Senate amendment:
 TED KENNEDY

(in lieu of Mr. CRANSTON),

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1460) to express the opposition of the United States to the system of apartheid in South Africa, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

SHORT TITLE

The House bill cited the act as the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985.

The Senate amendment cited the act as the Anti-Apartheid Action Act of 1985.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate provision.

FINDINGS AND POLICY DECLARATIONS

The House bill contains two congressional expressions of U.S. foreign policy: (1) Encouraging all nations to adopt policies guaranteeing broad human rights, civil liberties, and individual economic opportunities; and (2) condemnation and eradication of apartheid in South Africa.

The Senate amendment states that the policy and practice of apartheid harms the human rights of black South Africans, is repugnant to values of democratic societies, and runs counter to American efforts to promote democratic forms of government. It also declares that it shall be American policy to promote peaceful change in South Africa through diplomatic means, but where necessary through other measures as well.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate provision.

POLICY ON SANCTIONS

The Senate amendment states that it shall be the policy of the United States to impose economic sanctions against the Government of South Africa if, within 18 months of enactment but not later than March 1, 1987, significant progress has not been made toward ending apartheid.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate provision, with an amendment changing the time period to within 12 months but not later than January 1, 1987.

NEGOTIATIONS ON SANCTIONS

The House bill provides that the President shall attempt to persuade other governments to adopt economic restrictions similar to those in this bill and that the President report annually to Congress on the status of such negotiations.

The Senate bill directs the President to develop appropriate multilateral economic sanctions against the Government of South Africa through negotiations with other nations and to report annually to the Congress on the status of such negotiations.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate provision.

REPORT ON STATUS OF APARTHEID

The House bill requires an annual report on progress or lack thereof by the South African Government in eliminating apartheid.

The Senate amendment requires the President to transmit to Congress by March 1, 1987, and annually thereafter, a report on the extent of progress made toward ending apartheid, including a Presidential determination as to whether significant progress has been made.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate provision with an amendment changing the date to January 1, 1987, and inserting the conditions provided for in the House waiver provisions for the House provisions that would prohibit new investments in South Africa and the importation of krugerrands.

ADDITIONAL ANTI-APARTHEID MEASURES

The House bill contains a sense of Congress that the United States should take additional measures unless the South African Government makes progress toward eliminating apartheid.

The Senate amendment provides that in the event the President determines that significant progress has not been made toward abolishing apartheid, a recommendation is to be made to the Congress as to which of the following sanctions should be imposed: A ban on new commercial investment in South Africa, a ban on the importation of krugerrands, a denial of most-favored-nation tariff status to South Africa, or other economic or political sanctions.

The conference substitute is the Senate provision with an amendment removing from the list of prospective sanctions the ban on the importation of krugerrands and adding a ban on the importation of coal and uranium.

RESTRICTIONS ON NEW INVESTMENTS

The House bill requires the President to prohibit U.S. persons from making directly, or through a foreign affiliate, any investment (including bank loans) in South Africa. It exempts from this prohibition: (1) A loan or extension of credit for educational, housing, or health facility which are available to all persons and accessible to all population groups, or a loan agreement entered into before enactment of this act; (2)

an investment of earnings from a business enterprise in South Africa established before enactment of the bill and which is made in the same business enterprise; and (3) the purchase, on a securities exchange registered as a national securities exchange under section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, of securities in a business enterprise in South Africa established before enactment of the bill.

The Senate amendment authorized a ban on new investment as one of the prospective sanctions which the President may impose if he determines that no significant progress toward abolishing apartheid has been made and Congress approves.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate provision.

PROHIBITION ON IMPORTATION OF GOLD COINS

The House bill prohibits importation of South African krugerrands or other gold coins from South Africa.

The Senate amendment provides for a similar prohibition after 18 months if the President determines there is no significant progress toward abolishing apartheid and Congress approves.

The conference substitute is the same as the House provision.

MINTING OF U.S. GOLD COINS

The Senate amendment provides for minting of a U.S. gold coin.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate provision with an amendment adding language to provide that: (1) The gold coins shall be legal tender at their face value; (2) the Secretary of the Treasury shall make bulk sales of the coins at suitable discounts; (3) the profits from the sale of the coins shall be used solely to reduce the national debt; (4) the Secretary of the Treasury shall take all necessary action to assure there is no net cost to the government; and (5) a reaffirmation of current law that the coins and other gold and silver coins cannot be obtained dollar for dollar from the Secretary of the Treasury.

WAIVERS OF RESTRICTIONS ON NEW INVESTMENT AND IMPORTATION OF GOLD COINS

The House bill provides that the President may waive the prohibitions on new investment and gold coins for not more than 12 months if the President determines that one or more of eight conditions have been met and Congress approves the determination.

The Senate amendment does not contain a comparable provision.

The conference substitute is the same as the House provision, except it applies only to the ban on the importation of krugerrands.

EXPORTS OF COMPUTERS TO THE SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT

The House bill amends the Export Administration Act of 1979 to prohibit the direct or indirect export of computers, computer software, or goods or technology intended to service computers to or for use by the Government of South Africa or any corporation, partnership, or other organization controlled by the Government of South Africa.

The Senate amendment contains a comparable provision but specifies the government agencies of South Africa affected by the prohibition. It does not amend the Export Administration Act.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate provision with an amendment adding several entities to the proscribed list.

This provision restricts sales to the South African government of computers, computer software or goods or technology intended to service computers, allowing such sales only to those entities of the South African Government whose services are of benefit to nonwhites, or both whites and nonwhites except that this restriction may be waived if the sale is necessary for humanitarian purposes. The provision prohibits sales of computers and related parts and software to South Africa's military, police, and agencies which enforce apartheid, including national security agencies. This term is defined broadly to include all those entities that have a national intelligence function.

A major purpose of this legislation is to make certain the ban is complete on computer sales to the South African police, military, and other entities that enforce restrictions on blacks' freedom of movement, as well as on entities which have no beneficial impact on the nonwhite community. It is intended to close loopholes in current regulations, such as those relating to personal computers, and to prevent circumvention of the ban by the South African Government.

It is expected that in enforcing this ban, the administration will put into effect a system of end-use verifications on all computers covered by this provision sold to the South African Government, and on all computers for which spare parts and servicing are permitted. The end-use verifications must be adequate to assure that the computer in question is not used for prohibited purposes. The President is required to provide a detailed annual report to the Congress on the enforcement of the end-use verification system.

Computer companies are urged not to sell small- and medium-sized computers or to provide software or spare parts for computers owned by entities whose services are not available to nonwhites, even though the legislation explicitly bans such sales only if they have a contract value over \$100,000.

NUCLEAR EXPORTS

The House bill prohibits all nuclear cooperation between the United States and South Africa, including prior licenses or authorizations.

The Senate amendment prohibits the export of goods or technology to be used in any South African nuclear production or utilization facility, prohibits the authorization to engage, directly or indirectly, in production of special nuclear material in South Africa, prohibits the export to South Africa of component parts or other items or substances relevant because of their significance for nuclear explosive purposes, and prohibits the retransfer to South Africa of any of these goods, technology, special nuclear material, components, items, or substances unless the Secretary of State certifies that South Africa has become a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate provision.

LABOR PRACTICES OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

The Senate amendment directs the Secretary of State to take necessary steps to apply fair employment (Sullivan) principles to U.S. Embassy and contracts for services.

The House adopted a similar provision which applied only to Embassy direct hire personnel in H.R. 2068 (The Department of State authorization bill).

The conference substitute is identical to the Senate provision.

**EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES OF U.S. NATIONALS
IN SOUTH AFRICA**

The Senate amendment imposes mandatory fair employment practices for U.S. nationals controlling companies in South Africa. It establishes reporting requirements for U.S. companies and for the Secretary of State on U.S. and foreign company compliance.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute is the Senate provision with an amendment establishing an advisory committee and procedures for oversight inspection.

REGULATORY AUTHORITY

The House bill requires the President to issue regulations to carry out the act.

The Senate amendment contains regulatory authority in the provisions dealing with computer exports and employment practices.

The conference substitute is a combination of the two provisions.

ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

The House bill provides authority for the President to ensure compliance with the act and sets forth penalties for violation.

The Senate amendment contains specific violation provisions in the provision on computer exports and labor practices.

The conference substitute is the same as the House provision.

TERMINATION OF PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

The House bill provides for termination of the provisions of the act upon enactment of a joint congressional resolution concurring in a Presidential determination that apartheid has been abolished.

The Senate amendment contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute is the same as the House provision.

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR BLACK SOUTH AFRICANS

The Senate amendment sets aside \$15 million of the funds authorized for the education and human resources account for the Agency for International Development for scholarships for black South Africans to attend South African universities, colleges, and secondary schools. It provides for the U.S. Ambassador to appoint the selection panels who will select students for the assistance.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute is the Senate provision with an amendment setting the funding levels at \$8 million in fiscal year 1986, \$11 million in fiscal year 1987, and \$15 million thereafter and allocating half the funds for scholarships in accordance with the selection process described in the Senate amendment and half the funds for nongovernmental antiapartheid groups to carry out education, training, and scholarship programs.

HUMAN RIGHTS FUND

The Senate amendment makes permanent section 116(c)(2)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which provides assistance for human rights and increases the funding for these human rights grants to \$1,500,000 annually. Twenty percent of the funds are reserved for legal defense of victims of apartheid. In addition, authority to make these grants is transferred to the Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute is the Senate provision with an amendment changing the 20 percent to \$350,000 and expanding the criteria to include aid to community groups nonviolently resisting apartheid. These funds are intended to be in lieu of, not additional, to similar authority provided in chapter 4 of Part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

**EXPANDING PARTICIPATION IN THE SOUTH
AFRICAN ECONOMY**

The Senate amendment urges the U.S. Government to assist in all appropriate ways the realization by South African blacks of their rightful place in the South African economy.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute is the Senate provision.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

The Senate amendment makes OPIC insurance and guarantees available for joint ventures between American investors and black South Africans and waives the requirement for a government-to-government agreement.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute is the House position.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The Senate amendment instructs the Export-Import Bank to take active steps to encourage use of its facilities by business enterprises owned by black South Africans and waives the Evans amendment which prohibits Eximbank activities in South Africa.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute is the Senate provision.

HEALTH CONDITIONS IN THE HOMELANDS

The Senate amendment directs the Secretary of State to conduct a study and to report to Congress on health conditions in the Homelands.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute is the Senate provision.

APPLICABILITY TO EVASIONS OF ACT

The House bill makes provisions of the bill applicable to persons who act to evade those provisions.

The Senate amendment contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute is the House provision.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE ACT

The House bill provides that nothing in the act is to be construed as U.S. recognition of the "Homelands".

The Senate amendment contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute is the House provision.

**IMPORTS OF COAL AND URANIUM FROM SOUTH
AFRICA/NAMIBIA**

The House in H.R. 1555 (foreign aid bill) contains a provision which prohibits imports of coal and uranium from South Africa/Namibia.

The Senate amendment contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute is to provide that this is one of the sanctions which may be imposed in the future if the Government of South Africa does not achieve significant progress in abolishing apartheid.

From the Foreign Affairs Committee on all provisions (except section 17 of the Senate amendment) and modifications committed to conference:

DANTE B. FASCELL,
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ,
DON BONKER,
HOWARD WOLPE,
GEO. W. CROCKETT, Jr.,
MERVYN M. DYMALLY,
HOWARD BERMAN,
TED WEISS,
ROBERT GARCIA,
WM. BROOMFIELD,
MIKE DEWINE,

From the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee for section 17 of the Senate amendment and modifications committed to conference as additional conferees for the following sections: Section 3; section 4; section 5; sections 14(6) and 14(7) of the House bill; and section 8; section 15 of the Senate amendment:

FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
HENRY GONZALEZ,
FRANK ANNUNZIO,
PARREN J. MITCHELL,
STEPHEN L. NEAL,
DOUG BARNARD, Jr.,
BRUCE A. MORRISON,
CHALMERS P. WYLIE,
STEWART B. MCKINNEY,
JIM LEACH,
JOHN HILER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD G. LUGAR,
CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS,
Jr.,

NANCY LANDON
KASSEBAUM,
JOHN HEINZ,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
PAUL SARBANES,
ALAN CRANSTON,
BILL PROXMIER,

For section 15 of the Senate amendment:

TED KENNEDY
(in lieu of Mr. CRANSTON),

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

**REQUEST TO MAKE IN ORDER
CONSIDERATION ON THURSDAY,
AUGUST 1, 1985, OR ANY
DAY THEREAFTER OF SENATE
CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 32,
FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION
ON THE BUDGET FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1986**

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order to consider at any time on Thursday, August 1, or any day thereafter, the conference report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1986, or any amendment reported in disagreement from the conference, that all points of order against the conference report be waived, that it shall be in order for the House by motion to recede from its amendment with an amendment or amendments, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on such motion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask, if I may, the ranking Republican on the Budget Committee if he could answer a couple of questions from our perspective about it.

Could the gentleman give us some idea as to what the Budget Committee is likely to come to the House with in terms of first-year savings in the resolution?

Mr. LATTA. If the gentleman will yield, I would be happy to respond to the gentleman.

We are about \$55 billion hard savings. We have taken out the contracting in, and we have, I think, crafted a budget that will be bipartisan that we can support on our side. We did not get everything that we wanted in the conference in the way of savings and termination of programs.

I might say to the gentleman that I have been on every conference since the Budget Act came into being and this has been the most difficult conference of them all, and the longest. There were differences on taxes and differences on COLA's, but through hard work on both sides, I think that we have come up with something that we can support.

Overall, we have about \$276 billion in savings in 3 years, no new taxes, we have preserved COLA's, and I think it is something that we can be satisfied with when it comes.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, can the gentleman give us some idea as to how much of that \$276 billion over 3 years is reconciled in the proposal?

Mr. LATTA. If the gentleman will yield further, about \$68 billion at the moment, but we have not quite completed our conference.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and further reserving the right to object, I would be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] if he has any comments.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, has adequately described the situation. I think those terms are in the ballpark. We still have a way to go. We have not completed a budget resolution.

All this unanimous-consent request does is allow us, if we are able to complete one when the conference resumes at 11:30, if we are able to complete one it essentially allows this body to act on it before we depart.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that explanation.

One question I am getting from our side is, with the gentleman's unani-

mous-consent request, can we assume that the gentleman does have hopes that we will get this before us sometime yet in this legislative day?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield further, the reason we are bringing this unanimous-consent request before the body is because we do have just that hope.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me say that is my extreme hope that we can do that this afternoon.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand this proposal would increase budget authority for defense by \$10 billion over 1985?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, at this time we do not have an agreement on a budget authority for the entire budget, and there has not been a finalization of the 050, or the defense number.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Further reserving the right to object, I think it is premature to make this request because I remember what happened last October 1. We were in conference on the continuing resolution. There was an agreement made by others to increase budget authority for the Defense Department by \$8 billion. That became the floor for the defense part of the bill in conference.

A budget resolution is a goal for the Appropriations Committee. This is more binding on the House than the authorization bill. The authorization bill is a mere authorization and appropriations can be and are often less. We are talking here about a goal for the appropriation. You lock in a \$10 billion increase in the goal for the authorization, and when we get into the conference on the continuing resolution on October 1, we will be required to take \$10 billion out of other programs or else the deficit reduction will be cut by \$10 billion. There is no other way to do it.

I think the House is entitled to a separate vote on whether or not they want to eliminate the freeze on military. If the majority want to vote to go up \$10 billion, I would accept it but we ought to have a separate vote. If we grant a unanimous-consent request on this, there is no possibility. That eliminates the necessity to go to the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules will not have the opportunity to give us a separate vote on that.

For the last 3 weeks we have been passing little piddling thousand-dollar decreases to get bills down to the authorization or 1985 level on those bills, and we should not have one bill with a goal for a \$10 billion increase that would, way more than offset all that we have done in the last 3 weeks on appropriations bills.

For that reason, I have to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I will further reserve the right to object if somebody wants to say something.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would like me to respond, I will be glad to respond.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to strike part of the remarks that he just made?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I do.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves the right to object?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, let me respond to the distinguished gentleman, who is a senior member of the Committee on Appropriations, on which I also serve, and simply say at this time all this does is allow us to bring before the body a budget resolution conference report if we should achieve one. We do not know what the final figures will be, and certainly there are many Members who will have concerns about those final figures in a variety of areas.

There will be those who will dispute the target or the ceiling in function 050, or defense. There may be those who will dispute and have strong feelings about the low-income programs that some of us are hoping will be fully funded. There will be those who will not agree with certain assumptions with regard to eliminations, et cetera.

However, let me remind the body that we will have ample opportunity to express our wills individually on all of these issues because there will be a defense conference report of the authorizing committee that will come before this body some time. There will also be a defense appropriation bill that will come before this body, as the gentleman knows, which will come out of the committee on which he serves. There will be authorizations and appropriations committee bills where this House will have an opportunity.

All the budget resolution does is set a target and a ceiling. I would point out to the body, and particularly to those members of the Committee on Appropriations, that so far, the bills that have come forth from the Committee on Appropriations—I think there have been about four of those bills that have passed this House—are \$8 billion below the target set.

Thus, when you vote for the budget resolution, if there is a vote today, which I hope there will be, so that we can go home and tell the American people that we do have a budget, all this does is allow us to do that. We will be saying that these are the ceilings, these are the optimum targets.

However, as everyone knows, you will get an opportunity to vote on authorization bills, on conference reports, and on appropriations bills where this body will be able to work its legislative will if there are those who do not want to reach the ceiling.

So I would hope that we would not delay the possibility of passing a budget, sending a strong message to the financial markets of this Nation and to the American people that we are quite serious about fiscal responsibility simply because we see a ceiling and we are concerned about it. We will have an opportunity to work our will on the defense authorizing conference report as well as the appropriations bill, as well as others.

□ 1040

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, here is the problem: If you get this unanimous consent, then when you come back with the resolution, we will have waived the 3-day rule; we will have also waived the 5 hours of debate. We then will not have an opportunity for a separate vote on whether or not we want to freeze the military. The only possibility of getting that, as I understand it, is if we do not waive those rules, and go to the Rules Committee, and the Rules Committee can grant a rule for a separate vote on an amendment freezing the military function at the 1985 level.

I think, after we have struggled on eight appropriation bills for 3 weeks to reduce \$8 billion below the 1985 level, we ought not pass a budget resolution under this procedure and increase the military function by \$10 billion over 1985 and more than offset what we have done in the last 3 weeks.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I guess what concerns me, I say to my colleagues, No. 1, as I understand it, whatever allocation would come in from the Budget Committee, it is a maximum allocation that could then be cut in the appropriation bill or in a separate vote on the authorization bill.

No. 2, if my colleague will yield further, what we are doing here is basically delaying the process because it appears to me that if an objection is raised right here, we will in fact go to the Rules Committee. The House will basically take up this same budget after a rule has been passed, and we

will be here Friday or Saturday to do that kind of thing, and in fact we will end up with the same budget that the gentleman is proposing now.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, all I want is a separate vote on whether or not we are going to freeze military before September 30. We are going to get that military appropriations bill as the last bill this year, after we have done all this cutting. Then we are going to go over to the continuing resolution conference and the Senate conferees are going to say, "Hey, we have already agreed on this; the goal was for a \$10 billion increase," and that will be the end of it and all of our work on other bills will be down the drain.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could address the chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY], and make this inquiry:

Whatever the figure that the conference committee might reach on the 050 function, the defense function, would be, would it not, a maximum figure that would then be subject to further action in the appropriations process, and even in the unresolved authorization process, to determine what the actual level of authority for defense would be; is that correct?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman from Washington is absolutely correct. It is a maximum. It does not mean that the House is limited in its actions.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. As a practical matter, it does not work that way.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think it is important to emphasize this point: that we are in no sense, in accepting a figure for the defense function, saying that is the minimum figure or that that figure is not subject to further consideration downward possibly by the appropriation process.

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, before I yield further, let me have the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania—and I would not object if he would do this—agree to amend his request to provide that the House shall have a separate vote on whether or not to increase defense over 1985?

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point before he gets an answer from the chairman?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would like to have an answer to that question.

Mr. RUSSO. I think I can clarify that for the gentleman from Iowa if I

can bring up what happened at the meeting.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would like to have the chairman of the committee respond to that.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the answer to the gentleman's question is that that would violate the rules of the House, as I understand it, with regard to the unanimous-consent request with regard to the Budget Act.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. But by unanimous consent, we can waive the rules of the House. You can do that by unanimous consent. I am just asking the gentleman, will he amend his unanimous-consent request to do that?

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would like for the chairman of the committee to answer.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, while the gentleman is consulting, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, would it meet the gentleman's purpose if he were assured that in the consideration of the authorization bill on the Department of Defense authorization, a separate vote could be obtained by Members on the figure of that authorization level?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as a practical matter, I went through this last year, and I know what happens. Regardless of what is in the authorization, if we have your goal and we have established it by a vote in the House and the Senate and the goal is \$10 billion over 1985, when we get in that continuing resolution conference, they are going to say, "Hey, you have already decided that. You have decided that, so you take it out of other things." Then you will have reconciliation, and I know what they will be on. They will be on fisheries, they will be on law enforcement, they will be on the things that the administration did not request.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is, with respect, not a situation where the budget figure controls the authorization figure except as a maximum where the budget figure controls the appropriation figure, except as a maximum, and I think I can assure the gentleman that there will be an opportunity, regardless of what figure is set in the budget, for a lower figure, including a level of the previous position of the House to be considered in the authorization and the appropriation process.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, we need to do it in this process right here. What is wrong with unanimous consent to give us a separate vote on that? If the majority does not want it, all right, the majority said so.

What is wrong with the majority having an opportunity to vote on that?

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding under his reservation.

Let me just say to my good friend—and he is my good friend; as a matter of fact, we came to this Congress together, and we know something about what goes on around here—let me say that if we start amending the budget process to permit individual votes on everything that comes along, then we are going to have to go down the list and have individual votes on all the things that we have agreed on. We have never done this, and the gentleman knows that.

As has been explained by the gentleman from Washington, we will have an ample opportunity, as the gentleman well knows, when the appropriate spending bills come along to offer amendments. You can make your voice known then.

Certainly this is a very tenuous situation that we face, and let me stress this. This has not been easy. We have had a Senate that has been very, very difficult to deal with, and if we start doing these things, this is going to fall apart. I want to assure the gentleman that may happen, and he does not want that. I know he does not want that. The American people and the financial markets are waiting on action by this House on this particular piece of legislation. I am certain the gentleman would not want the finger pointed at him as the individual who stopped the budget resolution in its tracks. If we do what you want, I can assure the gentleman there is not going to be any conference report on the budget; it is not going to pass, and it will come all apart.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania and everybody who has been working on this have had the country's interests at heart in all of this. I could start and name function after function that I disagree with, and I would like to have a separate vote, but I do not want to prolong the procedure. We could go on for days arguing about all these things, and we do not want that.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about separate votes on everything. I am talking about a vote on just one thing, and that one thing is the biggest function in the budget and it determines whether we are going to have a freeze or whether we are not going to have a freeze.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for just one further thing—defense is taking the biggest cut, \$27 billion out of the \$55 billion in savings that comes out of 050. Does the gentleman know that? That is what is coming out of that particular function in the budget resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call for regular order.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT: THE TIME IS NOW

(Mr. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to make a serious effort to end the many years of deficit financing by this body. For 25 of the last 26 years, Congress has had to borrow money to finance the programs it has authorized. Our national debt now totals over \$1.8 trillion. The interest on this debt is staggering: Last year it totaled \$111 billion, a full 13 percent of the Federal budget.

This is fiscal irresponsibility, and it is time for it to end.

I am cosponsoring House Joint Resolution 27, the balanced budget amendment, as the best first step toward responsibility.

For the answer to soaring deficits is certainly not more taxes; the answer is fiscal responsibility. This body must discipline itself to establish priorities for financing Federal programs. Those with highest priority will get financed; those with lower priority must be cut back or eliminated. The answer is possible if only Congress would learn how to say "no."

Years of experience have shown that Congress cannot or will not do this; it cannot discipline itself to establish priorities. It seems that the only thing this body can say is "yes."

This balanced budget amendment would force Congress to establish national priorities for Federal spending. And it is only through establishing these priorities that we can begin to make some real progress toward reducing deficits. I think this can be done and I think it must be done.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

□ 1050

SAVE AMERICAN JOBS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, a recent news article reports that AT&T plans to move production of residential telephones to Singapore. These phones are currently produced in Shreveport, LA—and although this is not in my district this move is illustrative of what is happening to American jobs. About 875 jobs will be lost at the Shreveport plant, and over the next 5 years, AT&T will invest \$30 million in the Singapore operation, which will employ 1,000 workers who will be paid 25 percent of what American workers would be paid.

Unfortunately, this is not just an isolated incident. Increasing numbers of U.S. multinational corporations are turning their backs on American workers, setting up operations overseas and across the Mexican border. What this means is jobs for foreign laborers and more unemployed Americans. This has got to stop. This is crazy!

I have introduced a bill, the Foreign Subsidiary Tax Equity Act, that would discourage American corporations from moving overseas by plugging the current loophole in the Tax Code by requiring these runaway plants to pay tax on the income generated in tax haven countries.

The time has come for Congress to take action to stop American corporations from pulling up stakes and taking away American jobs. American workers need our help! I urge all of you to cosponsor H.R. 1914, the Foreign Subsidiary Tax Equity Act.

CONGRESSWOMAN HOLT RETIRING FROM HOUSE

(Mrs. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, after some months of prayer and deliberation, I am announcing that I will not seek reelection to an eighth term in the House of Representatives.

The reason I have decided to retire from the House is that I simply want more time with my wonderful husband, Duncan, and our seven grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, serving in this House has been a high honor of which I dreamed when I was a schoolgirl many years ago. I thank God that I have had this great privilege. I tried to represent my constituents to the best of my ability and I cherish the many wonderful friends I have come to know in this body.

I truly love this House and all that it means to this great, free country.

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, as most of you know, I was cochairman of the committee that promoted the Budget and Impoundment Control Act and then served upon the Budget Committee. The Budget Act today is far different than was intended.

Let me just say to you that our appropriation bills are under the House-passed budget resolution. I hope the Senate will agree with us.

Again we are living within the House passed resolution, but to go and add \$10 billion to the debt as insisted upon by the Senate is to step backward. It means little if there is no payment on the debt or deficit. In fact, none of the proposed budget resolutions require any reduction in either the debt or the deficit. If what we save goes to increase the carryover or the expenditures for military spending, it only means a transfer from domestic programs.

When we set up the Budget Committee, we did so because 42 percent of Federal spending was going around the annual review of our Committee on Appropriations. Now, after 10 years of operating with the Budget Act, 46 percent of our expenditures are beyond the annual appropriations review.

Not only that, but only 15.1 percent of spending is subject to action of Congress for discretionary spending. The other is tied down and in effect mandatory or for military spending.

The projected spending, however, for the Department of Defense as submitted in the budget for the next 5 years would increase to a figure which would leave nothing to run the domestic economy. I tell you now, defense must have public support. It must have behind it a strong economy, or we will have no defense. Military spending is just as dependent on our economy and our domestic programs as can be.

We just got through with a supplemental appropriation bill, which will come up again today. We argued and fussed with each other about every dime when it was to be used in this country. When we were asked to and did provide \$2,250 million for increased foreign aid for the last 2 months of the fiscal year, August and September, we heard no criticism, no discussion, no editorialism—nothing. They took it for granted that it was necessary to increase foreign aid.

We argue and fuss with each other about doing anything to protect our own country. I tell you again, you have given us a total figure and we are living within it. We in the House do have a budget resolution. All we need to do is insist that our Senators will agree with us. We cannot afford to go into debt further when we have such a large deficit—and we must reduce the

deficit and the debt. Nothing in the budget resolution that we deal with requires that.

Again, not a dime that you heard discussed in savings goes to reduce the deficit or the debt. We hope it will, but, if you are going to save it on one side and increase spending on the other side, we will go backward. We don't have to have the Senate to agree. We can draw the line and in conference insist that it be kept.

I ask you, give our Appropriations Committee a total figure as you have done and let us work it out as we are doing. Do not listen to a couple of economists to upset our hard work.

Our committee held hearings with thousands of witnesses with many years of experience. We are holding the line. Don't give our savings away—\$10 billion.

LET US NOT FORGET THE SEVEN AMERICANS HELD HOSTAGE IN LEBANON

(Mr. O'BRIEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1985, negotiations between Israel and Lebanon for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from southern Lebanon were suspended.

The United States and the Soviet Union agreed to open wide-ranging arms control talks in Geneva.

In New York, the jury in the trial of Gen. William Westmoreland's charges of libel against CBS began hearing the defendant's case.

First Lady Nancy Reagan was Time magazine's cover story for the week.

The Cubs lost relief pitcher Tim "White Shoes" Stoddard when he signed with the San Diego Padres.

And at 7:30 a.m., that morning of January 8, 1985, Father Lawrence Jenco my friend, was kidnaped at gunpoint in Beirut on his way to work as director of Catholic Relief Services for Lebanon.

Today marks the 205th day Father Jenco has been held hostage in Lebanon.

Today is the 503d day William Buckley has been held hostage in Lebanon.

Today is the 450th day of captivity for the Rev. Benjamin Weir.

Terry Anderson, the Associated Press bureau chief in Beirut, has been held hostage for 138 days today.

Today is the 52d day Thomas Sutherland has been held hostage.

Today is the 65th day of captivity for David Jacobsen.

Today also marks the 240th day since the disappearance of Peter Kilburn in Beirut.

Mr. Speaker, America has had a hostage crisis in Lebanon 500 days old. As each of us returns nightly to our homes, to eat supper with our families,

to sit with them in a family room, to watch a ballgame, a movie, a favorite program, to enjoy a cup of hot coffee and a piece of homemade cake, let us not forget the seven Americans still held hostage in Lebanon. Pray for them.

THE SLAUGHTER IN SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, for the second time in this century, millions of human beings are about to be slaughtered by a racist, diabolical government. In the 1930's and the 1940's, it was the government of Adolf Hitler in Nazi Germany who perpetrated the slaughter against the Jews. In the 1980's, it is the racist Government of South Africa about to slaughter their fellow countrymen.

The storm troopers, commanded from Johannesburg, have descended on the black townships with blitzkrieg speed and efficiency and isolated those townships and are now about to make those townships concentration camps.

We are going to witness a slaughter unlike any we have seen before and this time we cannot say that we did not know it was going on. We can expect the South African Government to dig in if it has no more pressure from the U.S. Government.

I urge all of my colleagues to understand what is going on and to join the Congressional Black Caucus members in requesting that the President revise his constructive engagement policy immediately and call on the South African Government to free Nelson Mandela and allow Nelson Mandela, who is the only recognized leader of all of the South African blacks, to participate in meaningful negotiations.

They should also call upon the South African Government to set a timetable for the granting of full and equal rights to the black population of South Africa.

WHAT IS A TERRORIST?

(Mr. COURTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, for some, the word "terrorist" is an epithet, a label governments apply to an enemy's guerrilla fighters but never to their own.

But this makes no sense. A terrorist is a man who deliberately seeks out the innocent, who deliberately maims or murders the uninvolved, for the purpose of enhancing the political shock effects of his crime.

It is therefore not true that "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter." No murderer of innocents is fighting for freedom. It is equally false to pretend that every government prosecutes foreign terrorists while sheltering its own violent zealots.

We have been waiting since December for Iran to bring to the bar of justice the Shiites who murdered two American passengers on a Kuwaiti airliner at Tehran airport. We are still waiting for Nabih Berri, who carries the title of Lebanese Minister of Justice, to see justice done for the murder of Robert Stethem. On the other hand, in Israel, 15 Jewish terrorists have just been convicted under Israeli law for crimes against Arab lives and property. The judges condemned their countrymen to prison, some for life sentences.

Mr. Speaker, some governors rule according to their inclinations, while others rule according to law.

□ 1100

COMMEMORATION OF BRIDGEWATER, VA, SESQUICENTENNIAL

(Mr. OLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. OLIN. Mr. Speaker, today, the small town of Bridgewater, VA, will begin a 10-day celebration of its sesquicentennial—the 150th anniversary of its charter being granted by the Virginia General Assembly.

Bridgewater is a fine example of a small Shenandoah Valley town. Settled in the mid-1700's, first by the Scotch-Irish, then by the English, Dutch, Welsh, and Germans, the early community served as a prosperous port on the North River, one of the three forks of the Shenandoah River.

It has survived the Civil War, with opposing troops on each side of the river; it has survived disastrous floods; and it has prospered, by the efforts of hardworking, churchgoing people who share a spirit of community and commitment. The influence of Bridgewater College, a small, private school founded in 1880, extends well beyond the town, preparing teachers, doctors, lawyers, ministers, business and community leaders for service throughout Virginia and the Nation.

Bridgewater is one of the treasures of the Shenandoah Valley. I am pleased to offer my congratulations as the celebration begins on its 150th birthday. I hope all of you will be able to visit us sometime.

SUPREME COURT ATTEMPTS TO SEVER GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the Supreme Court's so-called neutrality principle of religion, especially as it relates to the school prayer issue.

On June 4, 1985, in the case of *Wallace versus Jaffree*, the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional an Alabama statute authorizing a 1-minute period of silence in all public schools for meditation or voluntary prayer. While the Court allowed for the period of silence, it stated that the use of the phrase, "for meditation or voluntary prayer," respected the establishment of religion and thus violated the first amendment.

Justice Stevens, who deliberated the opinion of the Court, states that the Alabama statute "is not consistent with the established principle that the Government must pursue a course of complete neutrality toward religion."

Does the Court mean to imply that this self-declared neutrality requires the Government to be wholly secular and devoid of any acknowledgement of a Supreme Being and Creator?

That would, indeed, be odd, for the Supreme Court itself begins its sessions with the invocation, "God save the United States and this Honorable Court." And we ourselves begin each session with a specific prayer to a very specific God.

Therefore, I would like to suggest that the Supreme Court's so-called neutrality is nothing more than an attempt to remove any connection whatsoever between Government and religion.

In order to get religion back in the public schools, we need to sign Discharge Petition No. 1 at the desk today.

THE RACKETEER WEAPONS AND VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1985

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, with my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Mr. HUGHES and joined by Congressmen GREEN and WHITEHURST, I am today introducing a bill to help law enforcement officers combat crime by keeping guns out of the hands of criminals. This bill provides for a reasonable waiting period before a handgun can be purchased to ensure that potential criminals cannot obtain a handgun. At the same time, it also attempts to address some concerns of sportsmen and gun dealers.

Over 100 police chiefs have called for a waiting period. So do the major police organizations, who have urged me to submit this bill. They have good reason: Two-thirds of all police offi-

cers who died in line of duty last year were killed by handguns.

Public opinion polls show an overwhelming majority of the people support a waiting period. Newspapers endorse it. The Attorney General's 1981 Task Force on Violent Crime recommended it. And many sportsmen—tired of seeing reasonable law enforcement measures destroyed in their name—think it's a good idea.

As a nation, it is time to take the guns out of the hands of criminals.

COMPARABLE WORTH

(Mr. MONSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MONSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the controversial issues reemerging here is that of comparable worth—or equal pay for different work. The creative minds behind this proposal claim comparable worth is the same as equal pay. This is simply not true. Equal pay is the legal requirement that an employer must pay equal wages to men and women who do the same work. Comparable worth requires equal wages for jobs that are dissimilar but are thought to have the same worth.

As I have explained this difference to residents of my district in Utah, many have been surprised that Congress would spend time debating such a preposterous idea. Still, many are fooled by the rhetoric that this concept means fairness and equality.

The theory of comparable worth has many major flaws. First, it fails to address the reasons for the wage gap and presumes discrimination on the mere existence of a wage difference. Second, it ignores the civil rights and equal pay laws already on the books. Third, it assumes that each job has a measurable economic worth that can be scientifically and pragmatically determined and compared to different jobs.

I urge my colleagues in this body to look beyond the superficial and misleading language on this concept and examine the many flaws associated with it. Comparable worth is a concept that will not stand up under close scrutiny.

IT IS TIME TO BRING HOME THE REST OF THE HOSTAGES

(Mr. MINETA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year now Rev. Ben Weir has languished as a hostage in Lebanon. The Reverend Weir is one of seven such hostages whose fate concerns me deeply.

Reverend Weir's father-in-law lives in my district; and during the last year I have come to know and admire Rev-

erend Weir's family as they struggle to obtain his release.

We must not forget these hostages. We cannot allow this case to slip from our consciousness. We must insist that our Government do absolutely everything possible to bring these seven people back.

Frankly, I say this because along with many of the hostage families, I am not convinced that bringing these seven back is a top priority of this administration or of our State Department.

The hostage families tell me they feel that the administration is doing little, if anything, to bring these people home. At the time of the TWA hijacking, our President said he was committed to bringing all of the hostages home. Yet once the TWA hostages came home, we have seen the White House's focus on this problem dissolve and fade into vague statements.

Reverend Weir has been held for 450 days. It is time to bring him and the others home.

LET US SOLVE THE IMPUTED INTEREST IMPASSE

(Mr. HARTNETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to leave Washington for our 5-week summer recess, I must remind my colleagues that because Congress has failed to act in a timely manner, thousands of seller-financed transactions of real estate are on hold and our economy will suffer substantially from this impasse.

You will all remember that on two occasions in the past year, this body has voted nearly unanimously to address the imputed interest problem created by the 1984 Tax Act. However, we have succeeded in passing only stopgap relief which expired more than a month ago. Still remaining is adoption of a conference report—and it is that action which this body should take before concluding our legislative agenda this week.

It is my understanding that the differences in the imputed interest bills passed by the House and Senate are few. Only nongermane, minor areas of disagreement remain.

Please join me in urging the leadership in the Ways and Means Committee to work in a bipartisan spirit to remove the serious uncertainty which exists in this marketplace because of the lack of a final imputed interest solution.

PLEASE MEET WITH US, MR. PRESIDENT, ON THE STATE OF EMERGENCY IN SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. LELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, South Africa has now become a Fascist nation without question. On just yesterday the South African Government imposed the worst kind of cruelty on black people; the South African Government on yesterday, Mr. Speaker, denied black people the right to participate in public funerals.

Mr. Speaker, we have asked for a meeting, those of us in the Congressional Black Caucus, with the President of the United States to discuss with him the state of emergency in South Africa.

The President has yet to respond positively to that request.

We urge the President to sit down with those of us who care about the humanity of the people of South Africa, to meet with us. Over 900 people are incarcerated, Mr. Speaker, just as a matter of going to demonstrations against the imposition of the state of emergency, the curtailment of any kind or any inkling of human rights in South Africa.

Little schoolchildren are being arrested because they sing freedom songs in South Africa. Many hundreds of people now are suffering from all kinds of physical impairment and death, Mr. Speaker.

Something has to be done. Can we please get the President to respond positively to this issue?

TWO-TRILLION-DOLLAR DEBT PLUS INEFFICIENT BUDGET EQUALS A SCANDAL

(Mr. CRAIG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, the dog days of summer are here. With Congress out of town in August the press is known for reporting scandals—real or imagined.

I know of one scandal that deserves the examination of the American press. The scandal is perpetrated here in this great building. It is a growing debt—\$2 trillion and a budget process that, even when it works, is factually dishonest.

There is one way that Congress can come clean—can make this system honest again. That way is adopting a balanced budget tax limitation amendment to the U.S. Constitution. It's time has come.

PRESIDENT REAGAN SHOULD MEET WITH BLACK CAUCUS ON DETERIORATING SITUATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I join with the Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus and its entire membership to join in a request that that body be permitted to meet with the President of the United States at his earliest convenience with reference to the deteriorating situation in South Africa.

I hope that many Members in the Congress on both sides of the aisle will join in urging that this meeting between the President and this part of the House of Representatives, the Congressional Black Caucus, be agreed to and be arranged at his earliest convenience.

As is well known, the situation in South Africa is deteriorating, deteriorating at a rate faster than the news can report it. The U.S. Government and especially through the House of Representatives and the Senate have now taken measures to restrain the apartheid government and our relationship to it in a conference that was reported only last night. We are moving, but I think a meeting between the American black Representatives in Congress and the President of the United States is imperative.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that all of us join with the Congressional Black Caucus in facilitating this request and seeing that such a meeting is held forthwith.

THE IRS IS LICKING ITS CHOPS ON THIS ONE

(Mrs. VUCANOVICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we should be leaving this Chamber for the August break without resolving an important issue.

As you know, the House and Senate have passed legislation enabling homeowners and small businessmen to use seller financing in the sale of their property.

However, there has been no conference on this matter and therefore, as of July 1, 1985, the IRS started licking its chops.

They see these transactions going on as we speak and without any law to protect the seller; the IRS may begin to penalize these sellers.

It is our job to provide certainty in the marketplace and nothing is happening.

I call on the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to move quickly

to a conference so that we can go home and tell our constituents that the IRS has been held at bay.

POLISH-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

(Mr. KLECZKA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first day of Polish-American Heritage Month. It is a time to honor the important role that Poles and Polish-Americans have played in developing our Nation's culture and history.

This is an opportunity to send a message to Poles struggling for freedom and democracy in their country. We can send that message by honoring Poland's native sons and daughters who have brought with them ideas and talents nurtured over centuries of Polish history. We stand in solidarity with those brave individuals seeking to stem the tide of social injustice in Poland.

Poles and Polish-Americans have played important roles in shaping America's political and military history. Glancing back through the pages of history, we note names such as Casimir Pulaski and Thaddeus Kosciuszko, heroes from the Revolutionary War, or more recently, Zbigniew Brezinski and Edmund Muskie, to name only a few.

Polish-Americans have also contributed to America's cultural, educational, scientific, athletic, and entertainment heritage. Without a doubt, our Nation has been greatly enriched by the contribution of Polish-Americans.

Mr. Speaker, as a representative of a district with a large Polish-American constituency, and as a Polish-American myself, I am proud to rise in recognition of the first day of Polish-American Heritage Month. During this month, let us be especially cognizant of the important contribution that Poles and Polish-Americans have made to the patchwork of our Nation's heritage.

□ 1120

BIRTHDAY OF FRANCIS SCOTT KEY

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 206th anniversary of the birthday of Francis Scott Key, a man who made many valuable contributions to his native State of Maryland but gave his greatest gift to the country, our national anthem.

Born in Frederick, MD, August 1, 1779, Key was the son of a lawyer and a descendant of the original settlers in

Maryland. He was raised on the beliefs that founded this Nation: freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and the right to bear arms.

At Fort McHenry, in Baltimore, the British met their first major upset in the War of 1812. It was this battle which inspired Francis Scott Key to write the famous words: "Oh, say, does that star-spangled banner still wave, o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?"

Yes, my distinguished colleagues, thanks to American patriots such as Francis Scott Key throughout history, the flag does still wave. Two hundred and six years later, Key's words are as powerful and true as the day he wrote them. We, in Maryland, are proud on this day as should be the rest of this great country.

MISSING CHILDREN: SHAWN MICHAEL GERDON

(Mr. NELSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, every mother and father can understand how it feels to see their children after being apart even for a short time. But tragically, many parents in our Nation live each day in uncertainty about the welfare and whereabouts of their sons and daughters. I am delivering these comments today because I want to help bring attention to the problem of missing children.

I have been informed by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children that one of my young constituents in Florida has disappeared and is now listed as missing by the Center. According to the information provided to me by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, Shawn Micheal Gerdon was abducted by his father on November 16, 1979. He has not been seen or heard from since. In this photograph, the latest one we have of Shawn, he is shown at age 3.

Shawn was born on March 10, 1977, now 8 years old, has blonde hair and brown eyes. He is from Melbourne, FL. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children has asked that anyone having information about Shawn, please call 1-800-843-5678.

I would like to add that special efforts are now underway in my home State of Florida to help find missing children. The Adam Walsh Child Resource Center, located at 227 South Orlando Avenue, Winter Park, FL, (305) 629-1811, and the Missing Children Help Center, at 410 Ware Boulevard, Suite 400, Tampa, FL, (813) 623-KIDS, are excellent organizations designed to bring our sons and daughters home.

Each year 1.8 million children disappear. I urge all Americans to join us in helping to locate these youngsters.

SELLER-FINANCED PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS IN TAX LIMBO

(Mr. DREIER of California, asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, at this moment, it remains to be seen whether or not we will pass a budget resolution before adjournment. Yet it appears that we will break for the August recess without taking care of some other vital business.

In May, we passed legislation protecting the rights of private property owners to use seller financing in the sale of property.

The Senate passed this measure in June. No conference has taken place and on July 1, 1985, seller-financed transactions went into tax limbo.

I ask the Ways and Means Committee to solve this dilemma before we go home.

THE TIME HAS COME FOR U.S. SANCTIONS AGAINST APARTHEID

(Mr. FAUNTROY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, it has been 2 weeks now since the racist apartheid regime in South Africa declared a state of emergency, and with every passing day, the iron fist of Fascist repression has tightened. Twenty-five more people have been killed; 1,300 have been arrested without charge and without recourse. Only on yesterday, the regime added to the ban on blacks owning property and blacks voting and blacks' freedom of movement, a ban on the right of blacks to bury those who are being killed by the apartheid regime.

It is a sad time in world history. Quite frankly, however, we have seen some signs of hope as the world's conscience and its leaders have begun to respond. Last week, our ally in the free world, France, decided to do what we have been pondering for nearly 1 year now; banning new investments and the sale of Krugerrands in France.

The United Nations has now met and voted to recommend that member countries act voluntarily to impose sanctions. The tragedy is that we, in the United States, have, in response to the emergency, forfeited our rightful position at the forefront of this moral crusade.

The administration not only refused to agree to mandatory sanctions, but has maintained that it will not alter its position on constructive engage-

ment. We must meet with the President on this critical question and I hope that Members of conscience in the House will join the Congressional Black Caucus in requesting that meeting.

THE WOMEN OF AMERICA DO NOT WANT COMPARABLE WORTH

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, a recent nationwide poll conducted by Decision/Making/Information shows some very interesting results. The poll, conducted between November 26 and December 4, 1984, sampled 2,704 adult Americans and focused on a broad range of issues but concentrated primarily on specific issues of concern to women.

Here are some of the key findings: 80 percent of all female respondents favor providing more information about existing laws as a means of eliminating sex discrimination rather than passing more laws. Only 18 percent of the respondents would choose the passage of more laws.

Only 56 percent of the female respondents have heard of comparable worth. Of those who have, over 26 percent are only slightly familiar with the issue.

In general the poll showed that among the issues that particularly affect women, the most important topic was equal pay for equal work. Discrimination, of course, was also important. Interesting, though, was the way women felt about how remedies for discrimination should be carried out. Respondents tended to feel that private industry, or women themselves, should remedy discrimination in the workplace.

In short, not even the women of America want comparable worth. What they want, and what they rightly should receive, is better enforcement of equal pay laws for that already exists on the books.

AMERICA'S MASSIVE INTERNATIONAL TRADE DEFICIT—AN ISSUE BURNING THROUGHOUT THE NATION

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, over the last several months, many of my colleagues and I have taken to this floor in an effort to highlight the issue of America's massive international trade deficit. Our goal has been to elevate an issue which was dormant here in Washington, but has been burning for a long time throughout this Nation.

From the industrial heartland in the Midwest, to the high tech centers on both coasts; from the breadbasket of the Great Plains, to the textile communities of the South; from the timber centers of the Pacific Northwest to the oilfields of the Southwest—patience is running out. The House of Representatives has pushed and pushed this administration. We have done everything within our power to get the Reagan administration to grab hold of this issue and move it to the front burner—to take charge and lead our Nation on trade. America's standard of living is at stake. Nothing less.

Now, as we prepare to return to our districts, the ball is in the administration's court. We hope that we have been able to wake them up down there at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. We hope that during this next month, the administration will formulate a plan of attack on the trade deficit as the new Trade Representative makes his first official trip to Japan. Then, when Congress comes back, we can work together to solve this problem and give American workers and businesses a fair shake.

(Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

[Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

REVOLVING DOOR

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Since the House-Senate conference on the Defense authorization bill issued its report, there has developed some confusion as to the precise meaning of section 921 in that report, the "revolving door" provision. Some of the press have covered the revolving door matter in a rather awkward and inaccurate manner, and I would like to address some of these questions, briefly.

For example, some press reports said that the House-Senate language covered "the" primary person negotiating a contract, when actually that was changed in conference to say "a" person. This was done for the express purpose of not requiring the coverage to be limited to principal leadership.

Then some press went on to say that I was satisfied with the conference. Well, of course, anybody knows I was not very satisfied with it. But I had two things on my mind: One was the pressure to conclude the conference and the other one was that there is my conflict-of-interest bill which has been approved by the House Armed Serv-

ices Committee and which will be coming to the floor dealing with the question of the revolving door issue. This bill may help solve this problem in a much better way.

The third thing which has been said in the press is that there are very few people covered by this bill. As a matter of fact, there are many thousands covered by the bill. The only way in which you could arrive at saying that not very many people are covered is by saying it does not include the military. But it does include the military. In conference, just prior to agreeing on the language we would use this very question was discussed, and I said that the words "in Federal employment" were broad enough to cover the military. I have since been advised by legislative counsel that they are indeed broad enough. The actual language is on page H6523 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 29, 1985, and is as follows:

PART B—PROCUREMENT PERSONNEL MATTERS SEC. 921. POST-GOVERNMENT-SERVICE EMPLOYMENT BARS ON SENIOR DEFENSE OFFICIALS

Whoever being a Presidential appointee in Federal employment acts as a primary government representative in the negotiation of a government contract or the settlement thereof with a defense contractor shall not within two years after the termination of said activities with such contractor accept employment from that contractor and upon a knowing violation of this provision the employee shall be punished, upon conviction, with a prison term of up to one year and a fine of up to \$5,000 and said defense contractor shall forfeit up to \$50,000 in liquidated damages to the Federal Government which shall be provided for in the contract. The Secretary of Defense shall implement this provision by appropriate regulations.

I think this language is very clear. It includes both military and civilian employees of the Federal Government. This is what we intended; and we discussed it in detail in connection with the other phrase "a Presidential appointee", concluding that it would reach down to captains in the Army and comparably in the other services.

Webster's Dictionary tells us that "employment" means: "the state of being employed with a job that pays wages or a salary." That clearly applies to both civilian and military employees of the Federal Government.

When the Office of Management and Budget lists total Federal employment in its "Special Analyses, Budget of the United States Government" it lists civilian and military employment. When OMB wants to distinguish between the two it refers to "Federal civilian employment", and, of course, that makes sense. Unless one distinguishes, it is common practice to assume that Federal employment refers to both military and civilian. That's what the conferees intended

and that is what the English words mean.

Finally, the managers report makes clear on page H6647 of the July 29, 1985, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that the House and Senate bills were both concerned with limiting the post-Government employment activities of Department of Defense employees. The report notes that the Senate bill covers "employees (O-4 or GS-11 and above)," that is, "employees" clearly refers to both civilian and military employees. The report further notes that "the House receded with an amendment which would add a new provision to the Senate bill * * *."

I will take this matter up in more detail in September, but I would also like to say that my conflict-of-interest bill which was approved by the Armed Services Committee will also be coming to the floor. If, for whatever reason, the revolving door situation in the Department of Defense is not adequately addressed through the amendments to the authorization bill we will have another opportunity to do so when my separate revolving door bill comes before the House.

STUDENTS TO END NATIONAL DEFICITS WILL S.E.N.D. A MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman ANDY JACOBS and I announce the creation of a brand new nationwide youth organization. It's called Students to End National Deficits [S.E.N.D.].

These young people will no longer sit quietly by while Congress drowns their future in a flood of red ink. No, they're going to start speaking out. Loudly, eloquently and persistently.

They will no longer tolerate \$200 billion deficits, or the big-spending compromises which cause these deficits year after year. No, they're going to demand action. Now; and no more excuses.

These young debt busters, who stand to pay for all this fiscal profligacy, just might arouse the conscience of America. Let me ask any college student who wants to know more about Students to End National Deficits to write or call my Washington office.

America's young people are angry about the burdens Congress is placing on their future and Congress is going to hear from them.

UNITED STATES MUST ACT NOW FOR PEACE IN SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. CROCKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, Commonsense tells us that the only way to prevent a bloody racial struggle in South Africa is for the Government to talk—now and face to face—with credible black leaders. Yet, the Pretoria regime, in its obstinacy, travels in the opposite direction. It refuses to meet with Bishop Tutu and it continues to imprison more and more black leaders.

Mr. Speaker, the recent tragic developments in South Africa bring us back again to the crucial point noted in the Mandela Freedom Resolution adopted by the last Congress and sent to President Reagan. If the United States is to be a catalyst for peace in the South Africa situation, then President Reagan must publicly urge South Africa's white leaders to unconditionally release Nelson Mandela from prison and to participate with him and other black leaders in meaningful talks aimed at ending apartheid.

Mr. Mandela is key to any meaningful negotiations. The United States, like the British Foreign Office and the U.N. Security Council, can focus on this important need to free Mandela and, by doing so, demonstrate both to black South Africans and to the international community our commitment to the abolition of apartheid.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT RECESS UNTIL IT HAS A BUDGET

(Mr. KASICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday 49 of my colleagues joined me in sending you a letter urging consideration for keeping the House in session until a responsible budget has been passed by Congress. We believe that the House has the responsibility to address the deficit issue now and must not leave for the recess until this task is completed.

While I am very encouraged by recent news that the budget conferees are making substantial progress, we must all resist the temptation to make unreasonable demands on the budget negotiators. I hope the rejection of the Budget Committee's chairman unanimous-consent request does not signal the House's unwillingness to adopt a reasonable deficit reduction package. As with all conference committee compromises—and the Members here know it—no one will ever be totally satisfied. However, Chairman GRAY and Mr. LATTA are attempting to hammer out a bill that meets the concerns of this House, including defense spending, and I say let's give them a chance.

While you may or may not agree with this opinion, I think we must agree that the House should not go on vacation, Members of Congress should not go on vacation until they complete

our most important assignment, and that is to have a budget. I think we owe the American people that much.

WESTWAY LANDFILL

(Mr. GUARINI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, bipartisan support of a bill to bar construction of the Westway landfill in New York City continues to grow. Liberals, conservatives, Republicans, Democrats from every quarter of our State and Nation are united against this megahighway and private real estate development which would consume between \$4 billion and \$10 billion from our highway trust fund.

The damaging Westway landfill will eliminate a vital striped bass industry, and it paves over a significant part of the Hudson River. Moreover, New Jersey's lowlands would face severe flooding and drainage.

Public officials, private citizens, taxpayers, and environmental groups have gone on record opposing the project. Our colleague TED WEISS, in whose district Westway would be built, has fought it for more than 10 years. He favors trading in Westway for an alternate highway and aid to mass transit, and so do 74 of the cosponsors of H.R. 1888.

Westway is a threat to the future of our Federal Highway Program, our fiscal crisis, and our environment. I urge your support for H.R. 1888 and an amendment to the transportation appropriations bill which will be offered as a measure to prevent construction of the Westway landfill.

THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I am addressing the House today to talk about an issue which is a high priority to my constituents, the balanced budget amendment. As a matter of fact, polls have shown that this amendment is a national priority.

The people of this Nation want their elected Representatives to act responsibly. Yet this Congress has failed to balance the Federal books for the last 15 years. We have now entered an era of seemingly perpetual \$200 billion deficits. Why? Because there is no fundamental rule that says the budget must be balanced. There are laws that say we should have a balanced budget. The rules of the House are supposed to help us do that. But those rules are easily ignored and easily abused.

We've already done that numerous times this year.

The American people deserve, and the American people demand, a guarantee of fiscal sanity. A guarantee that their future and their children's future will not be spent away for political convenience. And this guarantee must ensure that our Nation will not be taxed into poverty to finance the spending programs which have created our present deficit.

The remedy is, of course, drastic. As a strict believer in the sanctity of our Constitution, I do not take this lightly. But such a serious and fundamental problem calls for drastic action. I implore my colleagues to heed their constituencies and get behind the balanced budget/tax limitation amendment.

□ 1140

KIM DAE JUNG UNDER HOUSE ARREST

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the only effective human rights policy is a vigilant and consistent human rights policy. Though we may protest violations at different times, our disapprobation means nothing if our eyes are easily diverted or our censure soft. The danger, of course, is that with the passage of time we lose the sharpness with which we originally view a problem. Such is the case today in South Korea.

When Kim Dae Jung made his return trip to South Korea in February, the attention of the world focused on a U.S. democratic ally that had no freedom of the press, arbitrary political rights, curtailed freedom of speech, and a president with virtually unchecked constitutional powers.

But the attention that Mr. Kim's return focused on his country produced results. In the months that followed, 13 political opposition leaders had their political rights restored. Kim Dae Jung was released from House arrest and allowed to meet with other political opposition leaders. For the first time in years, Mr. Kim's picture appeared in the newspapers. And in a surprisingly strong showing, the new Korea Democratic Party, the party of Kim Dae Jung and Kim Young Sam, surpassed the Government-sanctioned opposition in the national assembly elections.

Many of us in the Congress who had spoken out against the political repression in South Korea were equally vocal in our praise of these signs of progress. Yesterday, however, we learned that Kim Dae Jung had once again been placed under house arrest. He was told not to leave his home just hours before the start of his party's

political convention. Mr. Speaker, this is the same capricious and peremptory political censorship we had all hoped to see an end of in South Korea. It has no place in a full democracy, and it is my sincerest hope that my colleagues in the Congress will join me in decrying this action against Kim Dae Jung.

President Chun must know that our attention continues to focus on our friend, South Korea, and that we still hold his government to the highest standards of political pluralism and democratic principles.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON A BILL MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SUPPORT EXPRESSED FOR THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I will support the conference report on South Africa. Furthermore, I urge the President to sign that conference report, and I will actively fight to override any veto. I share with the eloquent members of the Black Caucus their anguish and concern over the repression in South Africa.

However, we must be concerned about oppression whether it is against blacks by whites in South Africa; against blacks by blacks in Ethiopia; against Islamic Afghans by Russians in Afghanistan, or by Russians oppressing Poles, Lithuanians, Ukrainians and over other Russians in the Soviet Union.

For every black arrested in South Africa, there are literally a thousand whites arrested in the Soviet Union. For every black killed in South Africa, there are literally a thousand Muslims killed by Soviets in Afghanistan.

Today we stand with the Black Caucus on behalf of human rights in South Africa. In September, when we return from the recess, I hope the

Black Caucus will join us in forming a truly nonracial human rights effort that looks at the entire world and seeks freedom and rights for every human being in every country.

BEING PROTECTIVE OF AMERICA IS NOT PROTECTIONISM

(Mr. LEVIN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago the Prime Minister of Japan delivered his country's plan to ease its huge trade surplus with the United States. Among other things, he said that he, "Does not understand the attitude of the U.S. Congress."

Mr. Prime Minister, as Congress adjourns today, let me try to explain our attitude. It is based on an assessment of the needs of our individual districts and States. It is based even more so on an assessment of our Nation's needs.

Your country has targeted American industries for Japanese economic efforts. We feel it is time for our Nation to target our industries in order to preserve them.

Your country has organized itself to expand its industrial base. We feel it is time for America to organize itself to preserve our industrial base.

If the shoe were on the other foot, and we are not producing many shoes anymore in the United States, if you had a \$40 billion trade deficit with the United States, you would not depend only on the good will of America. Your country would act. That is why we in Congress are insisting that Japan act and that our own administration act.

Being protective of America is not protectionism. Our efforts in Congress are not, it should be clear, anti-Japanese; they are pro-America.

THE HOUSE DESERVES AN APOLOGY

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic rules that we operate under in this body is the rule which says that we as Members are not to ascribe intent to that which another Member is doing. The basic rule, because what we attempt to do is have a spirit of comity in which what a Member is doing is considered to be serious.

Those rules not only apply to us as Members, they apply to the officers who serve this House. We in the minority have been told that those officers serve this House on a bipartisan basis. Today we have a memo from the Office of the Doorkeeper, in which the Doorkeeper or his staff has taken upon themselves to ascribe intent to

amendments to be offered by members of the minority.

This memo, relating to the Pay Equity Act, describes amendments to be offered by Mr. BURTON as dilatory and frivolous. Amendments to be offered by Mr. ARMEY as dilatory. I would say that that is absolutely unacceptable. It is unacceptable under the rules of this House. It is unacceptable as a manner in which officers of this House treat members of the minority.

I think that those two Members deserve an apology. I think the House deserves an apology from the officer.

THE LEADERSHIP WILL COME FROM HERE, NOT THE WHITE HOUSE

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not want to be dilatory in the presentation of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have been in the well of this House to speak out against the infamous conduct of the Government in South Africa. Indeed, my associate, Mr. GINGRICH of Georgia, just joined in that effort. I greatly fear that we are going to witness a bloodbath in South Africa unless this Nation takes the leadership that it should.

The tragedy of a bloodbath is that when people are caught up in a frenzy, white South Africans who have fought against apartheid will be hurt by blacks. There is no reasoning that goes on during a bloodbath.

Let me indicate to you that while I applaud the efforts of the Congressional Black Caucus to have a meeting with the President, I know that the President is not going to meet with us. He is not going to do it. During his entire administration he has chosen the people that he wants to meet with; only those who knuckle under to him and espouse his point of view.

I do not think that the President is going to move to free Nelson Mandela; he just does not have that kind of mentality insofar as people of color are concerned in other parts of the world. But I am not discouraged by these things.

On the other hand, I am very encouraged that in a Senate-House conference which ended last evening, there was an agreement that we would take strong sanctions against South Africa. So the leadership will come from here, this Congress, not from the White House.

WE NEED TO ACT DURING A DETERIORATING SITUATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I joined Chairman FASCELL before the Rules Committee requesting a rule on the conference report on the House-Senate agreement on the South African antiapartheid bill. I want to indicate that while I opposed this legislation when the issue was before the House, I believe the conference report reflects not only a fair and reasonable compromise, but also reflects a need to act in view of the deteriorating situation in South Africa in recent weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I believe it is most urgent and morally right that this body stay in session until we have an opportunity to act on this important legislation.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KANYAKU IMIN IN HAWAII

(Mr. AKAKA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor and privilege for me to rise today in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the first arrival of the "Kanyaku Imin" or the "government contract immigrants" who came from Japan to Hawaii.

As a nation of immigrants, we are all justly proud of the diversity of our ethnic heritage and of the tremendous contributions that each group has made to our country. This year, we in Hawaii are honoring the largest group of immigrants, the Japanese, who came to Hawaii, beginning in 1885, 100 years ago. They came as immigrant contract laborers to toil in our sugarcane fields and were the backbone of our early farm labor force, responsible in large measure for the successful development of our largest and most important agricultural enterprise, the sugarcane industry in Hawaii. The Japanese remained to become an integral and respected part of our community.

We are honoring this group of immigrants with a year-long series of activities and festivities in recognition of their contributions and accomplishments. As is true of many immigrant groups, their contributions were more recognized and appreciated as a group effort, in this instance, of providing the labor essential for a fledgling sugar industry rather than for individual achievements and sacrifices which nonetheless did occur. They fulfilled their contracts and acquitted themselves with honor.

Without overshadowing or detracting from the splendid accomplishments of the "Kanyaku Imin," no tribute to them would be complete without mentioning the contributions of their sons and daughters, products of their upbringing and a true credit to

them, through whom they realized their finest hopes and aspirations. Today, they include two U.S. Senators, a Governor, a mayor, a State school superintendent, numerous other elected officials, many members of our judiciary, and outstanding professionals and businessmen. Not too many years ago, the list also included a university president, a State supreme court chief justice and a Congresswoman.

For all this, the "Kanyaku Imin" are grateful and humbly proud, that in this land of opportunity, all this was possible in one generation. Today, many are American citizens by choice and not by accident of birth.

Mr. Speaker, this gentleman expresses his gratitude to and salutes the "Kanyaku Imin."

□ 1150

OUR ACTION ON APARTHEID ONLY A DROP IN THE BUCKET

(Ms. OAKAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am very grateful that there has been an agreement regarding the conference report on the apartheid issue. I, however, think that while I welcome that, I think it is only a first step in the right direction. It is an initial step. Frankly, it is a drop in the bucket.

We want an end to apartheid in South Africa. I think our country could be demonstrating its leadership qualities more by showing the kind of vision and force that other countries are doing in that direction.

TAKE SOCIAL SECURITY OUT OF UNIFIED BUDGET

On another subject, I am gratified to see that there is movement in taking the Social Security trust fund out of the unified budget. I have had a bill to do that which I have introduced with many bipartisan cosponsors for the last 4 years. It is H.R. 151. Let us catch that momentum. Let us depoliticize Social Security, take it out of the budget, the way it was when President Roosevelt signed it into law 50 years ago.

It would be very fitting if we did that this year because this is the 50th anniversary of that great social program and it would be appropriate to put it back where it belongs—out of the unified budget—so that we would not try to get our hands on what belongs to the senior citizens and the disabled people of our country.

IMPUTED INTEREST/SELLER FINANCING CONTROVERSY

(Mr. KOSTMAYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, the country is increasingly frustrated at the inability of Congress to act, at the inability of the House and Senate to agree on legislation.

The budget for 1986 is the most outstanding example.

But, another issue of concern to many, including many in my congressional district, is the imputed interest/seller financing controversy.

Some 15 months ago Congress promised realtors and others that the rules regarding seller financed real estate sales would be settled by the July 1, 1985 interim deadline which was established.

Now, in spite of the fact that both the House and Senate have passed bills which would permit seller financed transactions, while at the same time stop the potentially abusive mismatch of interest income and deductions that can permit tax avoidance, that deadline has passed.

Right now realtors and all those wishing to sell property are in a quandary. They don't know if future legislation will be retroactive to July 1, 1985. They don't know what the rules will be.

These taxpayers are losing faith with the Congress, Mr. Speaker, and with good reason. I hope the House and Senate managers of the respective imputed interest bills can get together.

We need a bill to resolve this important and outstanding issue.

A MEASURE TO PREVENT USE OF BANKRUPTCY AS BOTH A SHIELD AND A SWORD

(Mr. BOSCO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSCO. Mr. Speaker, today I submit the names of 65 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle for H.R. 2870, a measure to prevent bankruptcy from being used as both a shield and a sword.

A good example of what we are trying to prevent is Texas Air Corp.'s attempt to take over Trans World Airlines at a time when Texas Air's major subsidiary, Continental Airlines, is in chapter 11, owing almost a billion dollars to banks, insurance companies, suppliers, travel agents, ticket holders and a host of other victims. This same company now seeks to take over another of our Nation's largest airlines.

I thank our colleague, Mr. MINETA, for scheduling hearings on this subject as a majority of the Public Works Committee are now co-sponsors, and I encourage the Department of Transportation to give this transaction extraordinary scrutiny. Those who use our bankruptcy laws as a shield against creditors cannot at the same time use the same laws as a sword to conquer others.

ON BEING A PROTECTIONIST

(Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, it always amazes me that we want to inflict a sense of guilt upon ourselves when it comes to the question of protecting American industry and jobs. We have no hesitancy whatsoever to be called protectionists when we want to defend our country through military buildup. That is a protectionist attitude, and we should have it.

But it always amazes me that when we talk about trade, and when we talk about American jobs, when we talk about American industry, we shy away from the term "protectionist." There is nothing wrong with it. It is not alien to our basic thinking to want to protect American jobs, American industry. That is the reason we are strong today.

As we go back into our districts over the holidays, over the recess, I want my colleagues to go into the little mills, whether it is the lumber mills of the Far West or the steel mills of Minnesota or the automobile plants of Ohio and Michigan, or the textile mills of the South. I want my colleagues to talk to those people they do not hear from too much, those people who simply work day in and day out, pay their taxes, defend their country in times of emergency, and yet are beginning to lose everything that they believe in, because of our fear of the term "protectionism". Let us not be afraid to protect anything that is good for America.

I urge Members to do that and do not have a sense of guilt. There is nothing wrong with it.

ENVIRONMENTAL MISPERCEPTIONS ABOUT NEVADA

(Mr. REID asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, it's interesting how perceptions are developed. Some are passed from person to person. Others are transmitted through the media. Still others are developed from firsthand experience.

Recently, Public Lands Subcommittee Chairman JOHN SEIBERLING, other Members of Congress and I had the opportunity to get such firsthand knowledge of Nevada, information that will be used to dispel environmental misperceptions about the State.

We viewed more than 1 million acres of potential wilderness areas. In Nye County alone we spent 2 days touring more than three quarters of a million acres.

And what beauty we saw:

Areas with high peaks, wild lands and trout streams, as well as bighorn sheep, mountain lions and deer.

Geological landmarks that attest the former glaciation that shaped the highest great basin mountains.

A mountain with meadows and aspens, where elk roam freely.

Volcanic rock formations, dramatic cliffs, limestone geology, and even prehistoric archeological sites.

I'm proud that this sampling of Nevada geography not only creates a positive perception but also provides a critical foundation for those of us in Congress now working on wilderness legislation to protect Nevada lands for generations to come.

□ 1200

REVIEW OF 1960 ARTICLE SHOWS SITUATION IN SOUTH AFRICA HAS WORSENE

(Mr. DYMALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, more than 25 years ago I met a young soldier in the Army who was also a radio announcer for the U.S. Information Service and a writer. Twenty-five years ago he wrote about the oppression and the repression in South Africa. The magazine in which his article appeared became defunct and the article was lost. Much to my delight, he sent me a copy of the article last week.

Have things changed in South Africa? Yes, they have gotten worse. The situation today in South Africa, with the oppression, the fascism, the racism, the bigotry, the hate, and the discrimination, is worse today than it was in 1960 when I met my friend, who is now the State senator from Watts that famous community in California. My friend and senator, Bill Green, pointed out that the situation in South Africa, Mr. Speaker, is worse now than it was when he wrote that article in 1960.

Today this House, indeed the Congress, will have an opportunity to send at least a first message, if not a strong message. I hope that all the Members on both sides of the aisle will join in sending that message, not only to South Africa but to the President of the United States. And I say to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], that the Congressional Black Caucus accepts his challenge to join in a bipartisan, biracial effort to bring about human rights all over the world, including South Africa.

A LOSS OF DIGNITY

(Mr. FRANK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat surprised that among the momentous issues we were to talk about today was the accusation that the Doorkeeper had hurt the feelings of some Members on the minority side. I believe it would be a mistake for people to accept the assertion that some impropriety had been committed because the Doorkeeper characterized certain amendments. As I heard the characterization, I would agree that it was less than accurate. It seemed to me excessively flattering.

I am a little surprised that some of the Members on the other side who are great believers in very vigorous debate and who are not always averse to imputing mistakes to people on the other side can be so sensitive when people respond. It seems to me that sensitivity ought not to be a one-way street. I would just remind my colleagues to muse on the general principle that one rarely looks more ridiculous than when one is excessively concerned about one's dignity.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of open and free debate is a very important one, and it seems to me it ought even to extend to the Doorkeeper of this institution.

HOUSE ARREST OF KIM DAE JUNG

(Mr. PEASE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, this week Kim Dae Jung has been placed under house arrest, just days before the new Democratic Party is scheduled to hold its political convention in South Korea. This cynical display of power by the Government of South Korea represents a serious setback to the ongoing effort to secure a restoration of basic human rights and democratic institutions in that country.

I commend my colleague, Congressman Ed FEIGHAN, for leading the effort to protest the placement of Kim under house arrest. Hopefully, the Reagan administration will take appropriate action.

FURTHER SUPPORT FOR ENTERPRISE ZONES SOUGHT FROM THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACK KEMP] and I once again introduced a bill that we have been sponsoring since the days of Jimmy Carter—The Urban Enterprise Zone Act. Last year, in the 98th Congress, we had 283 cosponsors. In the 99th Congress I believe we will probably get over 300 cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the President, who every year in his State of the Union Message, either asks the Speaker to give him enterprise zones as a birthday present or asks us as Members of Congress to work with him on this issue, will take an active role in seeing that this legislation is passed. I do not often agree with the President, but on this issue I do. I, therefore, hope that he will make every possible effort, using all his persuasive powers to help us pass an enterprise zone bill. I believe we can make good use of enterprise zones. In some States they are presently in place, and they are working without Federal taxes, without the benefit of the support of Congress and of this legislation. We certainly need something to cut back on the high unemployment in our inner cities.

COMMISSION ON THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BICENTENARY

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. Res. 249) establishing the Commission on the U.S. House of Representatives Bicentenary, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the House of Representatives was established under the Constitution in the year 1789;

Whereas in the year 1989 the House of Representatives will celebrate the bicentennial of its establishment under the Constitution;

Whereas the House of Representatives for the past two hundred years has reflected the will and strength of the people of the United States and has, in its historical development, adhered to our national heritage of individual liberty and the attainment of equal and inalienable rights; and

Whereas it is appropriate and desirable to provide for the observation and commemoration of this anniversary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is established in the House of Representatives the Commission on the United States House of Representatives Bicentenary (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 2. FUNCTIONS.

It shall be the duty of the Commission to oversee the planning and direction of the commemoration of the bicentennial of the House of Representatives through an appropriate program of publications, exhibits, symposia, and related activities. The objective of this commemoration is to inform and emphasize to the Nation the role of the House of Representatives through two hundred years of growth, challenge, and change. The Commission is directed to develop a program, in consultation with the Office for the Bicentennial of the House of Representatives, that will draw upon the re-

sources of current and former Members, scholars, and the general public.

SEC. 3. COMPOSITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of 8 members appointed by the Speaker (in consultation with the minority leader) as follows:

(1) Six Members of the House, of whom not more than 3 shall be members of the same political party; and

(2) Two former Members of the House, of whom not more than 1 shall be members of the same political party.

The majority leader and the minority leader shall be ex officio members of the Commission.

(b) DESIGNATION OF CHAIRMAN.—The Speaker shall designate one of the members of the Commission to serve as Chairman of the Commission.

(c) VACANCY.—Any vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "Member" means a Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.

(a) RULES OF ORGANIZATION.—The Commission may make such rules with respect to its procedure as it considers necessary.

(b) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SEC. 5. POWERS

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to carry out its functions, the Commission is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

(b) ACQUISITIONS.—The Commission is authorized to acquire any work of art, historical object, document or material relating to historical matters, or exhibit for placement in the House wing of the Capitol or the House office buildings.

SEC. 6. STAFF.

The Commission shall be staffed by the Office for the Bicentennial of the House of Representatives and shall have full supervisory powers over such Office. The Commission may also draw upon the staff support of such other employees of the House or its support agencies as may be agreed to by mutual consent.

SEC. 7. PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.

The expenses of the Commission shall be paid from money appropriated to the Office for the Bicentennial of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8. PERIODIC REPORTS.

The Commission may submit periodic reports on its activities to the House. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

SEC. 9. TERMINATION.

The Commission shall cease to exist at the end of the 99th Congress, unless otherwise provided by law or resolution.

Mr. ALEXANDER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I reserve the right to object simply to make certain that I understand the procedure here. It is my understanding that this has been cleared by the minority?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes, the gentleman is correct. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield and if I may respond further, the resolution is for the purpose of establishing a Commission on the Bicentenary of the U.S. House of Representatives. It has been cleared by the minority. There are no funds required for its implementation, and it is simply for the purpose of planning, directing, and consummating a program for the commemoration of the bicentenary of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's explanation, and I am particularly appreciative of his making the point that this is a resolution that requires no new funding, and that in fact any expenses that will be incurred from this will be out of the office for the bicentennial in the House of Representatives, and that that is previously appropriated money.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes, the gentleman is correct. The Bicentenary Commission will be paid for and administered by funds and staff that are currently provided for.

Mr. WALKER. It is also my understanding that the representation on the Commission is equal between the majority and the minority in this particular instance?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes, it is equal, and it is bipartisan in makeup.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A PLEA TO THE PRESIDENT TO REPUDIATE OPPRESSION IN SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. WHEAT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus in sending a telegram to the President of the United States requesting an urgent meeting on the crisis in South Africa. Mr. President, we sought that meeting

to bring you a message of deep concern about the deteriorating situation in that troubled country.

Last night the conference committee on this body and of the other body endorsed that message and called upon the Congress to pass the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985. Upon passage of that legislation, Mr. President, we will call upon you to carry our message to the world, and our message is a simple one: The United States will no longer condone oppression in South Africa.

While you are sincere in your efforts to engage the South African Government in constructive dialog, that Government and the rest of the world perceive constructive engagement as tacit American approval of oppressive practices in South Africa. Mr. President, even the mere perception that Americans would tolerate South African repression is morally repugnant, and we call upon you now to repudiate that offensive misperception.

□ 1210

THE INSANITY OF APARTHEID

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to join with all my colleagues who have taken the well to challenge the insanity of apartheid, the cruelty and oppression of the reality of what is taking place in South Africa at this very moment and to raise the point that a number of my distinguished colleagues, as well as this gentleman, have asked the President of the United States for a terribly important meeting to discuss this incredible issue.

Over the last several days we received a report that Mr. Botha of South Africa refused to meet with Bishop Desmond Tutu, but there are those of us who reside in this Chamber who have a compelling, obvious, yet not exclusive interest in what is taking place in South Africa, who have the right to expect more from our President.

We can understand ignoring Bishop Tutu in the context of the madness of South Africa, but this is ostensibly a democratic society.

The President of the United States, whether or not we agree ideologically, is the President of all the people and in my estimation has a moral, a political, and intellectual obligation to meet with all of the persons who are duly elected and respected representatives of major constituents in this country. The President has a profound obligation and, indeed, a responsibility to meet with us on this incredible issue.

USE OF OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT MAIL TO LOCATE MISSING CHILDREN

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1195) entitled "An Act to require that a portion of the mail of Congress and the executive branch include a photograph and biography of a missing child," with Senate amendments to the House amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments to the House amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 15, of the House engrossed amendment, before "Section" insert "(1)".

Page 3, after line 18 of the House engrossed amendment, insert:

(2) Section 733 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the second sentence of the second undesignated paragraph the following: "Franks may also contain information relating to missing children as provided in section 3220 of title 39."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the minority has no objection.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SCHOOL-AGE CHILD CARE AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 60) to designate the week beginning September 1, 1985, as "National School-Age Child Care Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I will not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McKERNAN] who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 60.

(Mr. McKERNAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McKERNAN. Mr. Speaker, every day 3 to 6 million children return home to an empty house after school. Single-parent families, two working parent families, are in fact a reality in this country. Over 50 percent of women with young children

are in the work force today and therefore have child care needs.

This country needs to address our child care needs and we especially need to address the needs of those who return home to an empty house, so-called latch-key children. Especially those needs are children who return home to an empty house after school and also who need care before school.

I hope that the House will pass this resolution because I believe that by passing it we can call attention to what is a growing problem in this country through the designation of the first week of September as "National School-Age Child Care Awareness Week," and that will heighten the awareness of this growing national problem.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of my colleague, the gentleman from Utah, I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. BOGGS].

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as the chair of the Crisis Intervention Task Force of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, I certainly do not object to this resolution, but applaud it, because it will be a great encouragement and help to all the people who are engaged in the very compelling business of child care in the United States.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. McKERNAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McKERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend the gentlewoman from Louisiana for her work in the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, on this important issue. It is one that we really highlighted in the last session of Congress in the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families and it is one that I think her leadership has made a big difference in throughout the country, and I thank the gentlewoman for supporting this resolution.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 60

Whereas more than half of the children in the United States are in families in which both parents are in the work force;

Whereas more than one in five children in the United States are in a one-parent family;

Whereas changes in the composition of American families and the American work

force have resulted in an increased demand for child care for children of all ages;

Whereas the demand for child care for school-age children has increased at a greater rate than the availability of school-age child care;

Whereas estimates show that millions of school-age children between the ages of six and thirteen, often referred to as latchkey children, may return alone after school to an empty house or in the supervision of a slightly older brother or sister;

Whereas research studies have indicated that children in self and sibling care run greater physical and psychological risks, including accidents and feelings of fear and loneliness, than children who are cared for by an adult;

Whereas the Congress has begun to examine the issue of child care and the role of Federal and State government, the private sector, and parents in providing child care;

Whereas the parents, communities, employers, and agencies serving youth that have recognized the shortage of adequate and affordable school-age child care have developed after school programs for children in their communities; and

Whereas many more parents, communities, employers, and agencies serving youth need to address the problems facing these children and to maximize the use of State and Federal resources in collaboration with these efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning September 1, 1985, is hereby designated as "National School-Age Child Care Awareness Week" and the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate programs and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DRUNK AND DRUGGED DRIVING AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 137) to designate the week of December 15, 1985, through December 21, 1985, as "National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform that House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, as the chief sponsor, I would like to speak to it for just a moment.

Mr. Speaker, in 1981 I had the opportunity of going to the White House

and talking to the President of the United States about the problem of drunk driving. I pointed out to him that 26,000 people a year died as a result of drunk driving and 450,000 people a year suffered because of bad backs, paraplegics, quadriplegics, and injuries such as that.

He picked up a memo and he penned a letter to Secretary of Transportation Lewis. Out of that came the Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving, on which I had the privilege to sit with my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARNES].

We found a lot of things, Mr. Speaker, that were very interesting. We found that in America we do not take this too seriously. I notice today we are very serious about the problem in South Africa, and it truly is a problem, the problem in Chile and the problems in other areas, and they are truly problems; but here in America we seem to think it is all right to get ourselves up to a 0.05 blood alcohol count or 0.10, whatever it may be, getting in 2 tons of steel barreling down the road and kill 26,000 people per year.

We further found that the people in America who talk about this issue, especially our very respectful law enforcement people, have very little knowledge on how to recognize someone who is drinking and driving.

We found in this Commission that they actually use the archaic discovery methods of touching their nose, counting to 10 backward, doing one-legged pushups, and we find, and I say this very respectfully, that all over our 50 States they cannot identify a person who has been drinking and driving.

We further found, Mr. Speaker, that someone who gets in an S-turn with just a 0.05 blood alcohol count cannot make it. No one in America can make an S-turn with a 0.05 blood alcohol count.

We further found that all of our laws were to a 0.10 or 0.08. So we find in America that we are letting all these people loose every night to get in their cars with 2 tons of steel and go out and kill people. We can only recognize by archaic methods 26,000 of them that are killing people. It is absolutely amazing that we find this.

Out of this, however, Mr. Speaker, we were fortunate enough to have almost 40 States that have considered new drunk driving laws. Along came people who started things like Mothers Against Drunk Driving, Students Against Drunk Driving, Rid the Roads of Drunk Drivers, and fortunately we are starting to mitigate this problem in America.

If I may say in the most respectful terms, Mr. Speaker, I notice that every night we go to receptions around here and if people would carry in their wallets, as I do, and I am a teetotaler, that says, a card that says, "Know

your capacity"—that says that one drink will bring you above a 0.05 and then we noticed that our colleagues and the rest of us from both Houses and the executive branch go to these receptions, we have a drink or they have a drink at every one of these, and then get in their cars and go out on the road.

I would assume that the vast majority of these people who should be an example to the world find themselves with those who actually would lead to it. I hope the good Lord blesses them as they go out on the roads, because fortunately it has not come back to haunt this body or the body next to it, because of their own capacity of handling intoxicating beverages.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, if I may say so, that it really is not too bright to get in a car after having a few drinks. Can we not let somebody else drive us? Can we not take a taxi, and above all the laws which are merely speed bumps, what we really should do is, like our friends from Sweden who we talked to, on this Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving, have in our hearts and in our minds that we do not want to kill other Americans. If we get down to that, the laws absolutely do not mean a thing.

I would hope that we would realize that to drink and drive is absolutely stupid, as it is to take drugs and drive.

□ 1220

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 358, designating the week of December 15 through December 21 as "National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Week." As an original cosponsor of this measure I wish to thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARNES] for introducing this important piece of legislation.

Drunk and drugged driving has risen to epidemic proportions. Over the past decade our country has witnessed the death and injury of millions of Americans; death and injury directly attributable to alcohol and/or drug abuse. This horrifying social cost is further compounded by the tremendous economic cost of over \$20 billion each year. The tragic effect on our Nation's youth is especially alarming: drunk and drug-related driving is the leading cause of death of thousands of teenagers today.

As the ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Narcotics, I can attest to the select committee's involvement is not only the drug abuse problem, but the alcohol problem as well. Although the phrase "driving under the influence" is most often associated with alcohol, we must not

ignore the fact that drug-related driving incidents are also an ever-increasing problem.

Drug use in our Nation has grown considerably, among both the young and old. While we will continue to crack down on drunk and drugged drives alike, there is no substitute for an increased awareness among our parents, our teachers, and children on the disastrous effects of drunk and drugged driving. In this regard, I would like to commend the gentleman from Utah and my colleagues for establishing "Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Week" each year since 1982 during the December holiday season.

The designation of National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Week has a special significance at that time of year as the holiday season is a time of good will toward our neighbors and friends. Observance of this week will serve as a timely reminder and continue to draw attention to the serious effects of drunk and drugged driving.

Once again, I commend the gentleman for introducing House Joint Resolution 358 and urge my colleagues to fully support its adoption.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to also extend my commendation to the gentleman. I think this is a very important symbol of a horrendous thing that is taking place.

I have one of my former staff members who was hit by a drunk driver and her future fiancé was killed. She is now in a kind of comatose state and has been for about 2 years. When you see the reality of how this affects a family, and everyone on the Hill who knew Mora, it just really hits home.

This kind of event happens to thousands of Americans every year, and indeed, hundreds every day, and I think that we really have to do something in our country to end this horrendous tragedy which takes more lives than I think any war we have ever participated in.

So I really want to congratulate you, and certainly I think we will pass this unanimously.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind words of the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 137

Whereas traffic accidents cause more violent deaths in the United States than any

other cause, approximately forty-four thousand in 1984;

Whereas traffic accidents cause thousands of serious injuries in the United States each year;

Whereas more than 60 per centum of drivers killed in single vehicle collisions and 45 per centum of all drivers fatally injured in 1984 had blood alcohol concentrations above the legal limit;

Whereas the United States Surgeon General has reported that life expectancy has risen for every age group over the past seventy-five years except for Americans fifteen to twenty-four years old, whose death rate, the leading cause of which is drunk driving, is higher now than it was twenty years ago;

Whereas the total societal cost of drunk driving has been estimated at over \$24,000,000,000 per year, which does not include the human suffering that can never be measured;

Whereas there are increasing reports of driving after drug use and accidents involving drivers who have used marijuana or other illegal drugs;

Whereas driving after the use of therapeutic drugs, either alone or in combination with alcohol, contrary to the advice of physician, pharmacist, or manufacturer, may create a safety hazard on the roads;

Whereas more research is needed on the effect of drugs either alone or in combination with alcohol, on driving ability and the incidence of traffic accidents;

Whereas an increased public awareness of the gravity of the problem of drugged driving may warn drug users to refrain from driving and may stimulate interest in increasing necessary research on the effect of drugs on driving ability and the incidence of traffic accidents;

Whereas the public, particularly through the work of citizens groups, is demanding a solution to the problem of drunk and drugged driving;

Whereas the Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving, appointed to heighten public awareness and stimulate the pursuit of solutions, provided vital recommendations for remedies for the problem of drunk driving;

Whereas most States have appointed task forces to examine existing drunk driving programs and make recommendations for a renewed, comprehensive approach, and in many cases their recommendations are leading to enactment of new laws, along with stricter enforcement;

Whereas the best defense against the drunk or drugged driver is the use of safety belts and greater safety belt usage would increase the number of survivors of traffic accidents;

Whereas an increase in the public awareness of the problem of drunk and drugged driving may contribute to a change in society's attitude toward the drunk or drugged driver and help to sustain current efforts to develop comprehensive solutions at the State and local levels;

Whereas the Christmas and New Year holiday period, with more drivers on the roads and an increased number of social functions, is a particularly appropriate time to focus national attention on this critical problem;

Whereas designation of "National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Week" in each of the last three years stimulated many activities and programs by groups in both the private and public sectors aimed at curbing drunk and drugged driving in the

high-risk Christmas and New Year holiday period and thereafter; and

Whereas the activities and programs during "National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Week" have heightened the awareness of the American public to the danger of drunk and drugged driving: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of December 15, 1985, through December 21, 1985, is designated as "National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Week" and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADULT DAY CARE CENTER WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 229), designating the week beginning September 22, 1985, as "National Adult Day Care Center Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I have long been committed to improving the quality of life for all people, both in the United States and abroad. Today, I am pleased to be able to give my support to the recognition of a program that improves the quality of life for our elderly and their families. I am proud to cosponsor House Joint Resolution 229, a bill to designate the week of September 22, 1985, as "National Adult Day Care Center Week." I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HERTEL], for bringing this legislation before the House.

Adult day care is an organized program of structured activities designed to maintain or improve the physical, mental, and emotional functioning of frail, dependent, or isolated persons. Adult day care is a cost-effective alternative that can prevent premature or inappropriate institutionalization, provide respite to caregivers, curtail health care costs, and enable individuals to maintain their independence.

Our Nation has been experiencing the aging of our population. With improved nutrition and medical technology, more people are living longer. The group of persons aged 60 and older is the largest growing segment of our population. With this "graying of America" has come the need to provide support for those no longer able to be totally independent.

At the same time, we seem to be overburdened with health care and service costs. It is important, therefore, that we find innovative and cost-effective ways to provide the services needed by the people of this great country, especially our elderly. Day care programs for adults may be one way to accomplish this.

Adult day care programs provide various activities and services in a social group setting. These may include exercise; health and mental health screening; assistance with improving skills needed to perform activities of daily living, including the provision of occupational and physical therapy; reality orientation; and discussion group exercises to maintain or improve communication skills and memory. Nutritious, well-balanced meals are also provided.

An important function of adult day care is to prevent or delay costly institutionalization and to maintain independence. Many of our elderly have been prematurely or inappropriately placed in an institutional, long-term care facility, such as a nursing home, simply because the individual and his or her family had no alternative. More than 25 percent of those in nursing homes do not need to be there. Adult day care programs enable individuals to maintain their independent living by providing a safe, professional environment for them to spend 6 to 10 hours during the day. Adult day care also provides an important respite for families who want to care for their elderly relatives, but are hesitant to leave them alone during the day. A structured, supportive day program enables families to care for their elderly relatives at home while relieving the time and financial burden that home or institutional care places on family members. Many centers also offer support groups and other programs for the caregivers of the elderly. Day care is a welcome alternative to institutionalization for many individuals and their families.

According to the National Institute on Adult Day Care [NIAD], many activities will be held during "National Adult Day Care Center Week." The approximately 1,000 adult day care centers nationwide will be providing educational programs and holding open houses and ceremonies to increase the public's awareness about adult day care. Additionally, several new adult day care centers will be

opening during the week of September 22.

I am proud to be able to say that one of the centers scheduled to open during "National Adult Day Care Center Week" is located in my 22d Congressional District of New York, which I am proud to represent. Home-maker Service of Orange County, Inc., a nonprofit organization, is scheduled to open its adult day care center in Middletown, NY, during the week of September 22. This program is an innovative combination of public and private resources working together to provide a needed service in a cost-effective manner, providing a savings to both the individuals and to the public. This program was initially funded through a grant by the Orange County Office for the Aging, and is now funded by a grant from the city of Middletown's Community Development Block Grant Program as well as through private sources. I am proud of the cooperative efforts made by the private and public sectors in my district and look forward to joining in the events marking "National Adult Day Care Center Week."

The theme selected by the National Institute on Adult Day Care is "adult day care: Rising to the Challenge." I encourage my colleagues to join in actively supporting "National Adult Day Care Center Week," to assist Adult Day Care programs to indeed be able to "Rise to the Challenge" of informing the public about this alternative long-term care program and improving the quality of life for all of our senior citizens.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 229

Whereas there are 1000 adult day care centers nationwide providing a safe and positive environment to partially disabled adults and senior citizens in need of daytime assistance and supervision;

Whereas adult day care centers provide necessary health maintenance functions and medical care, including medication monitoring, therapies, and health education, and are operated by professional staffs who identify the need for additional health services and make appropriate referrals;

Whereas adult day care centers provide opportunities for social interaction to otherwise isolated individuals and assist them in attaining and maintaining a maximum level of independence; and

Whereas these centers offer relief to families who otherwise must care for disabled elderly persons on a twenty-four-hour-per-day basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning September 22, 1985, is designated "National Adult Day Care Center Week".

The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENSE OF CONGRESS COMMENDING MEDICARE ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) expressing the sense of the Congress that Medicare be commended on its 20th anniversary for the program's success in protecting older Americans against the high cost of health care, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, recognizing the 20th anniversary of the Medicare Program. As a cosponsor of this measure, I commend the gentleman from Florida, the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Aging, Mr. PEPPER, for introducing the House companion bill, House Concurrent Resolution 88. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this measure which demonstrates our firm commitment to maintaining the integrity of the Medicare Program.

Since the inception of the Medicare Program 20 years ago, countless individuals—the infirmed, the elderly, and the disabled, have enjoyed protection under this program. Indeed, over 28 million older persons and 3 million disabled individuals make Medicare the single largest personal health care financing program in the United States. Hundreds of thousands of physicians and more than 20,000 hospitals, nursing homes, home health agencies, labs, and clinics participate in the Medicare Program.

In more recent years the Medicare Program has had to respond to both the growing elderly population in this country and to the rising health care costs. Congress has been able to address in part, the changing face of

health care in this Nation by increasing Medicare benefits to include hospice and health maintenance organization [HMO's] services. Our task is, however, by no means finished. Throughout this Congress, as we continue in the fiscal year 1986 budget process, and as we attempt to enact significant deficit reduction measures, we must make the continued solvency of the Medicare Program our top priority. I believe that efforts to control escalating health care costs while improving the delivery of health care, is one of the most difficult and pressing dilemmas facing this Congress. By adopting this resolution we will be recognizing the enormous success of this program while reaffirming our commitment to the elderly and the disabled to protect their continued access to quality health care.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Medicare Program by adopting Senate Concurrent Resolution 9.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 9

Whereas Congress authorized Medicare in 1965 under title XVIII of the Social Security Act to consist of hospital insurance and supplemental medical insurance;

Whereas Medicare has contributed immeasurably to the security, improved health and extended longevity of older Americans;

Whereas Medicare provides health insurance coverage to thirty-one million aged and disabled persons, and is the largest personal health care financing program in the United States;

Whereas over half of all physicians serve Medicare patients, and over twenty thousand organizations—hospitals, nursing homes, home health agencies, labs, and clinics participate in Medicare;

Whereas Medicare is one of the most vitally important and successful programs in the history of the United States, without which many older Americans could not afford basic health care; and

Whereas one of the greatest social issues facing our Nation today is maintaining the integrity of Medicare to ensure the health and well-being of all older Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Medicare be commended on its twentieth anniversary for the program's success in helping to protect older Americans against the high cost of health care.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 144), recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Program, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 144

Whereas in 1935, most of rural America did not have electric lighting—nine out of ten farms were without central station electricity;

Whereas fifty years ago, on May 11, 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt created the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) by signing Executive Order 7037;

Whereas since 1936, Congress has passed and the President has signed legislation strengthening the role of the Rural Electrification Administration in assisting rural electric systems to ease the burdens of farm labor and meet the power needs of America's farmers, ranchers, and rural residents;

Whereas today, rural United States has electric power, nearly one thousand membership-owned rural electric systems provide service to about twenty-five million people in forty-six States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands;

Whereas Rural Electrification Administration borrowers have established a record of responsibility in meeting their repayment obligations unmatched in any other Federal program of financial assistance;

Whereas since 1961 Rural Electrification Administration borrowers have helped establish and expand more than twenty thousand commercial and industrial enterprises and community facilities that have created nearly one million new jobs; and

Whereas the Rural Electrification Administration, its borrowers, and rural people have formed a partnership that has brought electric power to those who live off the main roads and outside of the cities, thereby permitting them more fully to contribute to and share in the American dream: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the Sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the Rural Electrification Program must continue to provide financing and technical assistance at reasonable cost to ensure that the modern living standards of rural Americans and the quality of their communities are preserved through access to reliable and competitively priced electricity;

(2) the fiftieth anniversary of the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Rural Electrification Program should be recognized; and

(3) the people of the United States and Federal and State governmental agencies are encouraged to commemorate, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration, the past accomplishments and continuing

achievements of America's Rural Electrification Program with appropriate ceremonies and activities paying tribute to the thousands of rural electrification leaders throughout the Nation, who, in partnership with their Government, have made the United States Rural Electrification Program the symbol of hope and a model of excellence for other nations throughout the world.

● **Mr. DE LA GARZA.** Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 144, recognizing the 50th anniversary year of the Rural Electrification Program. This resolution, which I introduced with the Honorable EDWARD R. MADIGAN, ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, has the support of 147 cosponsors. The resolution, as amended, was unanimously approved by the Committee on Agriculture on July 30, 1985.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute that I offer was adopted unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture. It differs from the resolution as originally introduced only to reflect the fact that the 50th anniversary date of the Rural Electrification Program has already passed—it was observed on May 11, 1985. This amendment does not alter the meaning nor the intent of the original resolution.

It was 50 years ago that President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed an Executive order creating the Rural Electrification Administration. In those 50 years, the REA has worked with rural residents across the United States to better the quality of life of farm families and other rural residents through its Rural Electrification Program.

The Rural Electrification Program has an impressive record of accomplishments over the past 50 years. By working cooperatively with the REA, rural residents have built nearly 1,000 member-owned rural electric systems that provide electric power to about 25 million people in 46 States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. In the process, the REA has created nearly 1 million jobs, and improved the living standards of millions of rural Americans.

As important as the past accomplishments of the Rural Electrification Program, however, is the work ahead. Low commodity prices, high real interest rates, plummeting land values, heavy debt loads, and declining export markets have brought serious economic problems to farm families and small towns across rural America. Reasonably priced electric power is an important farm input. The Rural Electrification Program can continue to make electricity available to the American farmer at a reasonable cost, through the Nation's rural electric cooperatives.

House Resolution 144 expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the Rural Electrification Program must continue to provide reasonably priced financing and technical as-

sistance for rural electric systems that serve rural residents. I urge my colleagues to join me in commending the Rural Electrification Program for 50 years of service to rural America, and in expressing our support for the program's continued success.●

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
OFFERED BY MR. DE LA GARZA

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. DE LA GARZA: Strike out the text of the preamble and the resolution and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Whereas in 1935, most of rural United States did not have electric lighting, and nine out of ten farms were without central station electricity;

Whereas fifty years ago, on May 11, 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt created the Rural Electrification Administration by signing Executive Order 7037;

Whereas since 1936, Congress has passed and the President has signed legislation strengthening the role of the Rural Electrification Administration in assisting rural electric systems to ease the burdens of farm labor and meet the power needs of the Nation's farmers, ranchers, and rural residents;

Whereas today, rural United States has electric power, and nearly one thousand membership-owned rural electric systems provide service to about twenty-five million people in forty-six States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands;

Whereas Rural Electrification Administration borrowers have established a record of responsibility in meeting their repayment obligations unmatched in any other Federal program of financial assistance;

Whereas since 1961, Rural Electrification Administration borrowers have helped establish and expand more than twenty thousand commercial and industrial enterprises and community facilities in rural areas that have created nearly one million new jobs; and

Whereas the Rural Electrification Administration, its borrowers, and rural people have formed a partnership that has brought electric power to those who live off the main roads and outside of the cities, thereby permitting them more fully to contribute to and share in the American dream: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the rural electrification program must continue to provide financing and technical assistance at reasonable cost to ensure that the modern living standards of rural Americans and the quality of their communities are preserved through access to reliable and competitively priced electricity;

(2) the fiftieth anniversary year of the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration and the rural electrification program should be recognized; and

(3) the people of the United States and Federal and State governmental agencies are encouraged to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary year of the Rural Electrification Administration and the past accomplishments and continuing achievements of the Nation's rural electrification program with appropriate ceremonies and activities paying tribute to the thousands of rural electrification leaders throughout the Nation, who, in partnership with their Gov-

ernment, have made the United States rural electrification program the symbol of hope and a model of excellence for other nations throughout the world.

Mr. DE LA GARZA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2372, RAILROAD SAFETY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1985

Mr. WHEAT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-243), on the resolution (H. Res. 250) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2372) authorizing appropriations for carrying out the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1460, ANTI-APARTHEID ACT OF 1985

Mr. WHEAT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-244) on the resolution (H. Res. 251) waiving certain points of order against the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1460) to express the opposition of the United States to the system of apartheid in South Africa, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1230

NATIONAL FAMILY WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 31) to designate the week of November 24 through November 30, 1985, as "National Family Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I thank the chairman and the ranking Member for bringing this issue up.

Back in 1970, a constituent of mine who was a schoolteacher, and still is a schoolteacher but not a constituent any longer, brought the idea of observing National Family Week to me. I introduced it in that year, and I have been introducing it every year since 1970. In fact, this year it is the only observation that I have introduced or cosponsored.

The purpose of the National Family Week is simple: It sets aside a specific time during the year to pay homage to the one institution which has given so much meaning to human life and provided a stable structure to our society. It recognizes the importance of the family as the foundation of American life and the fundamental role the family has played in securing those values upon which our Nation was founded.

Today, more than ever, recognition of the American family is important.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that we cannot make this permanent legislation because of an agreement that the committee has to not consider these for payment status. Since 1972 the President has proclaimed the week including Thanksgiving, which is most appropriate, in my judgment, as National Family Week as a tribute to the American family.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation which is most appropriate.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 31

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of November 24, 1985, through November 30, 1985, as "National Family Week", and inviting the Governors of the several States, the chief officials of local governments, and the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARCIA: Amend line 5 by inserting after "November 30, 1985," "and the week of November 23, 1986, through November 29, 1986."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. GARCIA: Amend title so as to read: "Joint resolution to designate the week of November 24 through November 30, 1985, and the week of November 23 through November 29, 1986, as 'National Family Week'."

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD CRIME WATCH DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 168) designating August 13, 1985, as "National Neighborhood Crime Watch Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES. 168

Whereas neighborhood crime is of continuing concern to the American people;

Whereas the fight against neighborhood crime requires people to work together in cooperation with law enforcement officials;

Whereas neighborhood crime watch organizations are effective at promoting awareness about, and the participation of volunteers in, crime prevention activities at the local level; and

Whereas citizens across America will soon take part in a "National Night Out", a unique crime prevention event which will demonstrate the importance and effective-

ness of community participation in crime prevention efforts by having people spend the period from 8 to 9 o'clock postmeridian on August 13, 1985, with their neighbors in front of their homes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That August 13, 1985, is designated as "National Neighborhood Crime Watch Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 168 designating August 13, 1985 as "National Neighborhood Crime Watch Day." It is the Senate companion to House Joint Resolution 312 which I introduced earlier this year.

I am pleased that the Congress, by enacting this joint resolution, will be recognizing both the effectiveness and the growth of local crime watch organizations throughout the Nation.

The National Association of Town Watch is a national organization whose purpose is to promote and assist local crime prevention groups which work in cooperation with law enforcement officials. The National Association of Town Watch is sponsoring "National Night Out" on August 13, 1985, when neighbors are urged to spend the hour of 8-9 p.m. on their lawns, porches, and steps in front of their homes as a demonstration of community support for volunteer efforts to reduce crime in their neighborhoods. It is based on the idea that neighbors looking out for one another where they live and work is the most effective form of crime prevention.

A similar event last year successfully highlighted the efforts of local crime prevention programs, generated support for crime watch activities, and signaled to criminals that neighborhoods are pulling together to fight crime.

I urge that the resolution be passed.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL SECURITY DAY AND SOCIAL SECURITY WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 300) designating August 14, 1985, as "Social Security Day," and the week of August 11, 1985, through August 17, 1985, as "Social Security Week", and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSTAMANTE].

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge passage of House Joint Resolution 300, which declares August 14, 1985 as "Social Security Day" and the week of August 11-17, 1985, as "Social Security Week." I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] for their support on this resolution.

On August 14, 1935, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act into law. Fifty years later, Social Security is a vital system. In 1984 at least 36 million people received benefits under the Social Security Act. At the same time, more than 116 million workers continue to contribute over \$200 billion annually to the Social Security trust funds.

Social Security is the most significant legislative and social achievement of the 20th century. Each time we use our Social Security number, we are reminded of how much Social Security has become a part of our lives.

House Joint Resolution 300 has received the endorsement of the National Gray Panthers, the National Association of Area Agencies on Aging and the National Association of State Units on Aging. These organizations and others across the country are planning their own programs for the August 14 anniversary. The Social Security Administration has also scheduled a week-long program of activities. Furthermore, the governors of a dozen States, including my State of Texas, have issued proclamations declaring August 11-17 as "Social Security Week."

A congressional resolution will enhance this anniversary celebration. I thank my colleagues for their support, and I hope this golden anniversary will be a memorable occasion.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 300

Whereas the original Social Security Act, which was signed into law by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on August 14, 1935, represents the most significant social and legislative achievement of the 20th century;

Whereas, in the words of President Roosevelt, the Social Security Act represents the cornerstone of the Nation's commitment "to protect Americans from the hazards and vicissitudes of life";

Whereas basic income security under the Social Security Act has been provided to the elderly since 1935, to their survivors and dependents since 1939, and to disabled workers since 1956, and has included medical insurance coverage of the elderly and the disabled since 1965;

Whereas, in 1984, at least 36,000,000 people received benefits under the Social Security Act;

Whereas more than 116,000,000 workers jointly contributed over \$200,000,000,000 annually to the Social Security Trust Funds;

Whereas, before the enactment of the Social Security Act, two-thirds of our Nation's elderly Americans had no means of support, except that which could be obtained from their friends, families, and private charities; and

Whereas, because of the protections of the Social Security Act more than 85 percent of elderly Americans have incomes above the poverty line and 14,000,000 other Americans who would otherwise have incomes below the poverty line have incomes above it; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) August 14, 1985, is designated as "Social Security Day", and the week of August 11, 1985, through August 17, 1985, is designated as "Social Security Week";

(b) The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation—

(1) commemorating August 14, 1985, as the 50th anniversary of the signing into law of the Social Security Act; and

(2) calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week of August 11, 1985, through August 17, 1985, with appropriate, ceremonies, and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 300, just passed, as well as on the commemorative legislation passed today, including House Resolution 144.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2068, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1986 AND 1987

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 25, 1985, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2068) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 30, 1985, at page H6812.)

Mr. MICA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Today we bring to the floor the conference report on the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, known in this body as the State Department authorization. It has within it security for U.S. embassies and our personnel abroad, U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, and other foreign affairs activities.

Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to know that, of course, we passed a freeze on this legislation when it moved through this body some months ago. I think they would be proud to know that not only has that freeze been maintained in this conference report, but we are \$200 million, over a 2-year period, below that freeze figure.

I think we still carry out the vital functions of the State Department and related agencies and activities.

Some of the major provisions in the bill include diplomatic security, of course, some legislative initiatives regarding secure actions on fraud, visa, passport, and the like, and trying to strengthen our efforts to combat illegal and illicit drugs.

Mr. Speaker, we have a number of other items in the bill, but suffice it to say this: We have worked out some 95, I believe it was over 100 amendments

in contention, have come up to an agreement that I think all sides have come to approve.

The other body has already approved this legislation. I would like to commend the other body and its chairman for the diligent work they have done on this legislation, and the staff, to take 100 amendments in contention and work it out with as little trouble as was really quite a feat in that time.

□ 1240

Also, I would like to commend my ranking minority member, Ms. SNOWE, for the work that she has done; the Foreign Affairs Committee staff for the fine job they have done; in particular the leadership of our chairman, Congressman FASCELL of Florida, the tremendous job he has done.

I think this is the smoothest and the best approach we have seen in a number of years on this legislation, and I am very proud to present it to the House in this fashion.

Mr. Speaker, today we bring to the floor the conference report on the Foreign Relations Authorization Act which provides funding authority for the Department of State, security for the U.S. embassies and personnel abroad, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, and other related foreign affairs activities.

The conference substitute is approximately \$200 million under the House-passed freeze level for fiscal years 1986 and 1987.

Some of the major provisions of the bill include:

Greater funding of security to our diplomats;

New legislative authorities to strengthen counter-espionage efforts;

Further strengthening of efforts to combat illicit drugs;

Funding to speed modernization of broadcasting facilities of the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty;

New authority for a scholarship program for undergraduate students from developing countries designed to counter Soviet efforts particularly in the Western Hemisphere; and

New arms control initiatives, including a 2-year authorization for the arms control and disarmament agency.

I want to commend the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in the other body and his staff for their exhaustive efforts and their spirit of cooperation. I would also like to thank our House Foreign Affairs staff for their efforts over the last few weeks, and I would particularly like to thank the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the full committee, Mr. FASCELL, for his guidance in managing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will not belabor the discussion, but urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Several technical problems have been discovered in the conference report since it was filed last night.

Although section 113 reflects a change in the date by which the UNHCR is directed to comply with the section's specified audit, that new date is not reflected in the managers' statement. It was also the intent of the managers that the conference report language specify that the term "independent consultancy" as used in the bill, means a recognized, management consulting firm which is independent from the United Nations.

The conference report also indicates that the House provision establishing a commission in the Department of State to investigate Soviet and international Communist behavior has been accepted by the conference committee. Instead, it is the understanding of the conference committee that State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research will perform the study.

In section 812, entitled "Japan-United States Security Relationship," the word "should" in subsection 812(c) was intended to read as "shall."

In addition, in section 813(b) of the bill entitled, "Diplomatic Equivalence and Reciprocity," the reporting requirement is stated as a "sense of the Congress." The committee of conference intended that the Secretary of State and the Attorney General shall prepare a report for the Congress pursuant to section 813, and that the sense of the Congress phrase be deleted.

Section 150(c) was intended to provide that the nomination, appointment, and initiation of the new Office of Inspector General would be accomplished, or substantial progress made on or before 6 months after the date of enactment of this act. This would coincide with the report requirement in subsection (c). It is recognized that, during this period of time, the Department would continue to perform inspection functions under existing law, that is under section 209 of the Foreign Service Act.

After negotiations of the managers on a provision entitled, "Employees of the United Nations," dealing with the extent to which international civil servants employed by the United Nations are required to return all or part of their salaries to their respective governments, an error was made in recording the agreement on subsection (c). Section 151(c) of the legislation should now read: (c) reduction in contribution if substantial progress not made.—If the Secretary of State determines pursuant to subsection (b) that substantial progress has not been made in correcting this practice, the United States shall thereafter reduce the amount of its annual assessed contribution to the United Nations by the amount of that contribution which is

the U.S. proportionate share of the salaries of those international civil servants employed by the United Nations who are returning any portion of their salaries to their respective governments.

I would also note that the conferees share in the concern over the worsening U.S. trade deficit, particularly the imbalance in trade between the United States and Japan. We do not want this problem exacerbated in the area of air-freight services. We believe that the viability of U.S.-flag-carrier freighter services is essential to the development of U.S. exports and to our national defense through the Civil Reserve Air Fleet Program.

In particular, the conferees are aware that the Japanese recently received valuable additional air-freight rights in the course of bilateral negotiations. The conferees request that no further expansion of Japanese access to U.S. air-freight markets occurs during the period covered by this authorization in order to enable the U.S. Government to state a clearly defined policy on international air-freight service. That policy statement shall encompass the already established congressionally mandated goals for U.S. air-freight service and shall be formulated jointly and submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress by the Departments of State, Commerce and Transportation, and the U.S. Trade Representative.

The conference report as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD also contains a sentence on page H6837 relating to employees of the United Nations which reads as follows: "The conference substitute does not make mandatory a reduction in the U.S. contribution to the United Nations." It was the intent of the managers that this sentence be deleted from the conference report.

Mr. HAWKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida some questions of clarification.

It is my understanding that language under sections 112 and 118 of the conference agreement will permit the Secretary of State the discretion to make determinations respecting the applicability of section 2(f) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act and any other law administered by the Secretary of State to individuals employed by contract to perform personal services abroad.

The Committee on Education and Labor is concerned that the language "any other law administered by the Secretary" could be construed to grant the Secretary of State authority to decide questions of eligibility of such individuals for medical and disability

benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act (FECA).

Is it your understanding that the authority to decide such questions is exclusively that of the Secretary of Labor?

Mr. MICA. The distinguished Chairman is absolutely correct. We have discussed that, and the answer is yes.

Mr. HAWKINS. If the gentleman will yield further, is it also your understanding that in no way can the language in sections 112 and 118 of the conference report be construed to affect the Secretary of Labor's existing authority under FECA to determine questions involving an individual's employment relationship with the U.S. Government?

Mr. MICA. The Chairman is correct, yes.

Mr. HAWKINS. Can we, therefore, conclude that the language as expressed in the conference agreement is consistent with the position of the House?

Mr. MICA. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAWKINS. Can we also conclude that the conference agreement is consistent with the recommendations contained in Secretary Brock's letter of July 29, 1985, to the chairman, Mr. FASCELL, and the ranking Republican member, Mr. BROOMFIELD?

Mr. MICA. Yes, Mr. Chairman; that is also correct. That is with respect to the provisions in the FECA.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that that letter be included in the RECORD. It is my understanding that a letter from the Secretary of State regarding this matter is en route and is consistent with the language of the conference agreement.

Mr. MICA. Yes; that is also my understanding.

Mr. HAWKINS. I would ask that this letter also be included in the RECORD upon its arrival. I thank the gentleman for this clarification.

The letters follow:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
SECRETARY OF LABOR,
Washington, DC, July 29, 1985.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to request that the House conferees agree to an amendment on H.R. 2068, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency and the Board of International Broadcasting, and for other purposes. The amendment would be consistent with what we believe to be the intent of the House in adopting two provisions concerning the availability of Federal workers' compensation benefits for persons hired pursuant to personal service contracts under authority created by this legislation. By separate letter we are requesting that the Senate conferees recede to the House with the same amendment.

This action by the conferees is necessary in order to prevent the bill from establishing an unfortunate precedent for coverage

under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA). FECA provides workers' compensation benefits to Federal employees and persons who are deemed to have an employment-type relationship with the Federal Government. Sections 110 and 115(b)(3) of the Senate substitute, however, would go beyond this current FECA approach by explicitly providing benefits for individuals who have no employment-type relationship with the Federal Government. Specifically, the Senate substitute would make FECA benefits available to independent contractors who have entered into business relationships with U.S. missions abroad whenever any such contractor is injured on the job. This would not only be contrary to the intent of the FECA, but also open the door to extension of the program to cover other independent contractors, both within the U.S. and abroad.

The House bill contains language that was intended to solve this problem. Even though we believe that the intent of the House is clear, the text of the House provisions seems to indicate that those hired under contract authority are not Federal employees for any purpose, including FECA, regardless of the nature of their actual employment relationship with the Federal Government under traditional legal concepts. Accordingly, we recommend that the conferees accede to the position of the House in this matter, but accept an amendment of the House provisions to help ensure that the intent of the House is properly effectuated.

A copy of appropriate amendments is enclosed. The amendments would use language first suggested by the Administration in S. 659. The language is identical to that used in connection with personal service contract authority in the Foreign Assistance Act (22 U.S.C. 2396(a)(3)). The amendments state that personnel hired under the personal service contracts in question are not Federal employees with respect to laws administered by the Office of Personnel Management. By not specifying the status of these personnel under FECA, which is administered by the Department of Labor, it allows this Department to determine—as it has for many years in similar situations—whether an individual has the necessary employment relationship with the Federal Government to establish FECA coverage.

The amendments would also affect the application of the provisions in question to the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA). Both the House bill and Senate substitute deal with FTCA coverage in connection with the personal service contracts involved in the same manner as they deal with FECA coverage. Our proposed amendments would, as with FECA, allow case-by-case determinations of employment status for FTCA purposes.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this letter to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM E. BROCK.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
SECRETARY OF LABOR,
Washington, DC, July 29, 1985.

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on
Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR BILL: This is to request that the House conferees agree to an amendment on H.R. 2068, a bill to authorize appropriations

for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency and the Board of International Broadcasting, and for other purposes. The amendment would be consistent with what we believe to be the intent of the House in adopting two provisions concerning the availability of Federal workers' compensation benefits for persons hired pursuant to personal service contracts under authority created by this legislation. By separate letter we are requesting that the Senate conferees recede to the House with the same amendment.

This action by the conferees is necessary in order to prevent the bill from establishing an unfortunate precedent for coverage under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA). FECA provides workers' compensation benefits to Federal employees and persons who are deemed to have an employment-type relationship with the Federal Government. Sections 110 and 115(b)(3) of the Senate substitute, however, would go beyond this current FECA approach by explicitly providing benefits for individuals who have no employment-type relationship with the Federal Government. Specifically, the Senate substitute would make FECA benefits available to independent contractors who have entered into business relationships with U.S. missions abroad whenever any such contractor is injured on the job. This would not only be contrary to the intent of the FECA, but also open the door to extension of the program to cover other independent contractors, both within the U.S. and abroad.

The House bill contains language that was intended to solve this problem. Even though we believe that the intent of the House is clear, the text of the House provisions seems to indicate that those hired under contract authority are not Federal employees for any purpose, including FECA, regardless of the nature of their actual employment relationship with the Federal Government under traditional legal concepts. Accordingly, we recommend that the conferees accede to the position of the House in this matter, but accept an amendment of the House provisions to help ensure that the intent of the House is properly effectuated.

A copy of appropriate amendments is enclosed. The amendments would use language first suggested by the Administration in S. 659. The language is identical to that used in connection with personal service contract authority in the Foreign Assistance Act (22 U.S.C. 2396(a)(3)). The amendments state that personnel hired under the personal service contracts in question are not Federal employees with respect to laws administered by the Office of Personnel Management. By not specifying the status of these personnel under FECA, which is administered by the Department of Labor, it allows this Department to determine—as it has for many years in similar situations—whether an individual has the necessary employment relationship with the Federal Government to establish FECA coverage.

The amendments would also affect the application of the provisions in question to the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA). Both the House bill and Senate substitute deal with FTCA coverage in connection with the personal service contracts involved in the same manner as they deal with FECA coverage. Our proposed amendments would, as with FECA, allow case-by-case determinations of employment status for FTCA purposes.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this letter to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM E. BROCK,

U.S. Department of State,
Washington, DC, August 7, 1985.

Hon. AUGUSTUS HAWKINS,
CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In connection with the pending enactment of H.R. 2068, the State Department authorization bill for FY 86-87, I would like to clarify our understanding as to the intent and effect of sections 112 and 118 of the bill.

Sections 112 and 118 concern the overseas contracting authority of the Secretary of State. It is the position of the Administration—and we understand that this position is consistent with that of the managers of the bill for the House of Representatives and the Senate—that neither sections 112 or 118 contained in the Conference Report may be construed so as to affect the Secretary of Labor's existing authority under the Federal Employees Compensation Act to determine questions involving the employment relationship of any individual with the United States Government and the application of any benefits under that act to any such individual. It is further understood by the Administration that the terms "any other law administered by the Secretary (of State)" may not be construed, and is not intended to grant the Secretary of State any authority to decide questions of eligibility of such individuals for medical and disability benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act.

In addition, the Department of State is in full accord with Secretary Brock's letter of July 29, 1985 on the same subject with respect to the Federal Employees Compensation Act.

I would appreciate it if you could make this letter a matter of record in connection with the enactment of this measure.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. BALL III,
Assistant Secretary

Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations, the gentlewoman from Maine, the ranking minority member, and the other members of the subcommittee, all of whom were conferees, for the outstanding job they did in handling this complex legislation so adroitly, first in the House and then in conference.

Agreement on this major legislation where there were more than 90 differences between the House and Senate versions is another strong indication of congressional determination to work in a bipartisan manner to assure that the views of Congress are taken into account in the shaping of our national security policies.

Increasingly America's security and our economic welfare are linked to events around the globe. We have no choice other than full involvement in world affairs. To be successful the United States must maintain a strong, first-rate diplomatic establishment just as we sustain a strong military.

Congressman DAN MICA, chairman of our International Operations Subcommittee, and his colleagues on the subcommittee have done an outstanding job in crafting legislation which will assure that the President has the kind of foreign policy instruments needed to protect and promote American interests abroad. I also want to commend my counterpart, Senator RICHARD LUGAR, for the vigorous leadership he has displayed in assuring that both this bill and the foreign aid bill will soon be law.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Senate and the House, and in particular the two subcommittee chairmen, the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. BONKER], and the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], as well as the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], for their successful effort to establish in this legislation a clear statutory basis for international telecommunications satellite policy. This provision assures that, as the international telecommunications networks enters upon a newly competitive era, the United States will firmly support policies that assure the continued viability of Intelsat. Intelsat has served well U.S. national and foreign policy interests since it was created by the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, and this provision will assure that it will continue to be able to do so.

Finally, I would like to thank the members of the full committee staff and the staff of the International Operations Subcommittee for the excellent job they did in assisting us with this very important legislation.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from Florida in urging the House to adopt the conference report for the State Department authorization, and I want to take this opportunity to commend him for his excellent leadership on this legislation. He has managed this legislation in a fair, efficient manner during the entire process, from subcommittee hearings through the resolution of over 90 differences in conference. I also would note for the Members of the House the speed with which this legislation has moved through the legislative process. This authorization, along with the foreign aid bill, are the first major authorizations to be passed in final form. I think all the members

of the full Foreign Affairs Committee, particularly our chairman and ranking Republican, deserve considerable credit for the work they have done.

I would also like to thank my colleagues on the International Operations Subcommittee for their valuable contribution. Each of the members played an important role in the development of this authorization, and it was because of their efforts that we have before the House legislation that should receive your strong support. And I should not go on without also praising the efforts of our staff. Their work over the past 2 weeks is responsible for what was certainly the most cooperative and productive conference I have ever experienced.

At every stage of this bill's progress through the House, those involved have worked together in a genuine spirit of cooperation and compromise. I am pleased to say that that process continued during conference. The conference report we have before us now represents a fair compromise with the other body, contains a number of important new initiatives, and comes in below a freeze from last years appropriations.

Unlike the foreign aid bill, the issues contained in the State Department authorization do not create headlines. But while the foreign aid bill is Congress' strategic input into U.S. foreign policy, the State Department authorization deals with the tactical nuts and bolts of foreign policy. Through the State Department authorization, Congress has great influence on the structure and direction of U.S. foreign policy. This bill authorizes appropriations, and establishes policies for a wide array of bodies, such as the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, and a range of international organizations.

Expenses and fiscal constraints have been constantly in our minds as we have worked to fashion this bill. The conference report is \$70 million below fiscal year 1985's appropriated level. We achieved these reductions even while maintaining the important modernization programs of Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty.

The heart of the bill, of course, is authorization for the basic functions of the Department of State. Although the State Department is the smallest of the Federal departments, it is involved in many vital areas not usually thought of as core State Department activities. Such efforts range from international drug control, to combating terrorism, to control over the export of sensitive technology.

Many of the new initiatives contained in the bill were requested by the administration, but the legislation before us is very much an expression

of congressional will. Probably the most significant new initiative in the bill is the first congressional action on the Inman panel report on overseas security, on which my colleague on the International Operations Subcommittee—the gentleman from Florida—served so ably. The improvements contained in this bill for security measures at the Department of State and U.S. missions abroad, is a reflection of the Inman panel's call for a new security ethic at the Department of State. But while the increased profile for embassy security in the bill is significant, the task before us is far more vast than can be fully addressed in this legislation. I can assure the Members of the House that we will continue working to implement the full scope of the Inman panel recommendations, so that U.S. missions abroad will cease to be easy targets for terrorist threats.

I would like to draw special attention to several other provisions relating to the State Department. During subcommittee hearings, the State Department requested that its permanent authority to provide funding for United Nations and Middle Eastern peacekeeping forces be abandoned. I, and other members of the Subcommittee, felt that such an action would move in the wrong direction. We believed that it would be more productive to bring Congress earlier into peacekeeping decisions by requiring yearly authorization for the appropriation of funds for U.N. peacekeeping forces. I am pleased that this provision was retained in the conference report.

This bill also addresses the thorny issue of reform in the U.N. budget process. For the first time, both bodies passed provisions dealing with needed financial reform in the United Nations, and the final legislation before us would give the President leverage to encourage real reform at the United Nations. Agreement was reached that if the United Nations has not instituted weighted voting on budget matters after two more General Assemblies, the United States would cut back its contribution to no more than 20 percent of the U.N. budget. Presently, the United States is assessed 25 percent of the U.N. budget, but we have one lone vote on deciding how much money the United Nations should spend, and how our money should be used. Let me assure my colleagues that this provision will carry out the intent of Congress.

The automatic majority of votes on spending proposals from countries that provide negligible funding, is a direct cause of the U.N.'s fiscal irresponsibility. Thanks to the efforts of my colleague from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], who offered the House provision on the United Nations, we are all aware of the excessive salaries and pensions of U.N. employees. What may

not be as well known, is the number of needless projects and programs that get underway because of the current voting practices at the United Nations.

For instance, in the midst of the severe and tragic famine in Ethiopia, the United Nations decided to build a new multimillion-dollar conference center in Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia. Of course, the United States is still expected to pay a quarter of the costs.

The provision in the conference report, however, should not be construed as anti-United Nations. This is made clear in the statement of managers, and in fact the bill authorizes a full U.S. contribution to the United Nations for the next 2 years in anticipation that progress will be made. There is a growing consensus on both sides of the aisle, in both bodies, and in the United Nations itself, that budget reform will be key to the continued health and viability of the United Nations.

Before moving away from the Department of State, I would like to mention that the conference report contains the basic language passed by the House expressing our concern over the murder of DEA agent Camarena in Mexico, and that country's slow progress in taking action against drug traffickers that endanger all U.S. citizens unfortunate enough to be mistaken for drug agents. A compromise was reached that would urge in the strongest terms that the State Department issue a travel advisory for the most dangerous areas of Mexico until the cases of a number of murdered and missing Americans are resolved.

Another major provision in the State Department bill authorizes funding for the U.S. Information Agency. Last year USIA began a much needed modernization program. The subcommittee looked carefully at actual outlays in this program at USIA, and decided that the administration's request for the agency could be scaled back without endangering the modernization program.

The bill also shifts a requested \$3.3 million for USIA's new Worldnet Television Program to the Book Program, which has long suffered, the subcommittee believed, from insufficient funding. This shift provides for more controlled and purposeful growth in Worldnet.

The bill and the conference took several important actions relating to the National Endowment for Democracy, which has been controversial in the past. Subcommittee members and conferees approached this issue with the determination to arrive at agreements that all sides could support. We provide in this bill for full disclosure of the Endowment's actions as if it were a Government agency to reassure those who questioned its activities. We did this, however, without placing an

undue burden on the small staff and resources of the National Endowment for Democracy. We reached agreement with the other body on support for the important activities of the party institutes, while ensuring that the institutes have no financial connection with the parties, and have no involvement in political campaigns, whether foreign or domestic.

A third major area in the legislation is authorization for the Board of International Broadcasting, which oversees the activities of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. There are two significant provisions relating to the Board for International Broadcasting. One provision allows for the inauguration of a radio program to Soviet-occupied Afghanistan, if it proves technically feasible. Another provision urges increased broadcasting to the Jewish population in the Soviet Union, and calls for a study on the advisability of establishing a separate Radio Macabbee to broadcast to Soviet Jewry.

I urge my colleagues to vote for passage of this legislation, so that before we begin the August district work period, we can take some pride in having achieved final passage this week on the two key foreign affairs authorizations: The foreign aid bill, and the State Department authorization. This will have been a considerable accomplishment, especially considering the difficulties with the foreign aid bill over the past few years. Such an accomplishment would be due largely to the energy and spirit of cooperation of the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida, and the ranking Republican of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan.

In addition, I have nothing but praise for my colleague from Florida on the subcommittee for his leadership on this legislation. As the new chairman of the International Operations Subcommittee, the gentleman did an exemplary job managing the bill, and as the new ranking Republican on the subcommittee, I always found him cooperative, and most of all fair. I look forward to working with him on other issues to be considered by the subcommittee and on oversight of these agencies.

Mr. Speaker, we have brought the House a sound authorization bill, and I urge the Members to support the conference report.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemanman yield?

Ms. SNOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. I would just like to take a moment to thank the gentleman for the very fine compliments and say that the cooperation that we have seen on this subcommittee, the full committee and on the floor of this House I think has been unmatched

this year, and it would not have been possible without your work and the work of the minority, and we are very pleased that we have come this far this year.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and also his exemplary leadership on this issue. Not only has he been cooperative but he has been fair in every respect.

So I would urge, Mr. Speaker, passage of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking Republican on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer my support for the conference report before us. Thanks to the hard work of both Members and staff and the spirit of cooperation which has prevailed, the report before us was made possible. I urge my colleagues to adopt the conference report for the State Department authorization.

The conference report we have before us represent a fair compromise with the other body. The report contains a number of important new initiatives and has authorization levels below the 1985 freeze levels.

Through the State Department authorization, Congress has great influence on the direction of U.S. foreign policy.

This bill authorizes appropriations, and establishes policies for a wide array of bodies. These include the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, and a range of international organizations.

Unlike the foreign aid bill, which was recently passed, the issues contained in the State Department authorization do not create headlines. The authorization, however, is critical in that it deals with the nuts and bolts of foreign policy.

It is commendable that fiscal constraints have been carefully considered in the crafting of this bill. The conference report is not only \$150 million below the House-passed bill, but is \$70 million below fiscal year 1985's appropriated levels as well.

Although the State Department is the smallest of the Federal department, it is involved in many vital areas not usually thought of as traditional diplomatic activities.

The most significant new initiative in the bill is the first congressional action on the Inman panel report on overseas security. The improvements contained in this bill for security measures at the Department of State and U.S. missions abroad are a reflection of the Inman panel's call for a new emphasis on security at the Department of State.

Another important aspect of the bill is a call for financial reform in the United Nation's budget process. A key provision allows for the inauguration of a radio program to Soviet-Occupied Afghanistan and urges increased broadcasting to the Jewish population in the Soviet Union.

I urge my colleagues to support this conference report and pass the State Department authorization.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. McCAIN].

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] for yielding to me, and I would also like to echo her views concerning the outstanding work of our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICAL], who has done yeoman-like work in order to achieve a bipartisan and widely supported piece of legislation.

I do not believe that it could have been possible without the active participation and leadership of Congresswoman SNOWE.

I would like to discuss the issue of the National Endowment for Democracy, which has been the subject of a great deal of scrutiny and debate over the last few years. Valid concerns have been raised.

And I believe that this bill addresses most of these concerns. Some of those concerns were allegations of improper grants to questionable organizations; possible use of NED funds for direct involvement in a country's political activities, and the question of funding for the Democratic and Republican Party institutes.

I believe that beginning at the subcommittee level, these issues were largely resolved. The USIA now has the right to audit the National Endowment for Democracy. Language setting out restrictions on grant activities including consultations with U.S. chiefs of missions overseas is included.

Specific language on limitations of the activities of the party institutes, a very important item, is in this bill.

The conference substitute leaves full coverage of the Freedom of Information Act in place, yet it relieves some of the Freedom of Information Act's burden.

The USIA will be responsible for all costs and litigation relating to requests for the release of information.

There was some questions about how the grants were made and the decisionmaking process that was involved. I believe that the Freedom of Information aspect of this bill will clear up a lot of controversy surrounding that issue.

□ 1250

The National Endowment for Democracy has an important role to play and has already made great strides in

aiding the establishment of Democratic institutions in other countries. With the language included in this year's authorization, I believe we have made it more accountable to the American taxpayer, important changes have been made, and I believe they deserve our support.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman for his efforts in this area and I am pleased the conference committee accepted his recommendation and initiative. The gentleman from Arizona certainly has made a valuable contribution in developing the proper approach to opening up the files and providing access to the documents at the National Endowment for Democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House should know the contribution the gentleman has made, because it was his insight that led to an appropriate solution without creating an undue burden on the agency. So I want to commend the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and also other issues within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee.

Mr. McCAIN. I thank the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. SNOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of this committee, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee as well as the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, our ranking member [Mr. BROOMFIELD], and the distinguished gentlewoman from Maine for their cooperation and their assistance and understanding. I wanted to express it not only to all of you but to the staff as well.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. SNOWE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I join my colleagues in commending the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICAL], our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], and our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], for bringing this measure to the floor in such an expeditious manner, similar to the ex-

pedition manner in which we adopted the foreign aid bill just a few days ago.

I want to particularly commend our staffs for having worked out the numerous complex issues that were involved in this measure, saving valuable time on the floor and in conference.

This measure, Mr. Speaker, deals with some extremely important issues: Security of diplomatic posts, the National Endowment for Democracy, and particularly those sections relating to narcotics trafficking which strengthen the International Narcotics Matters Bureau's personnel system and increase interagency cooperation with respect to the sharing of information on drug traffickers. We also urge new extradition treaties and the creation of a new International Commission on Narcotics.

With regard to security, this conference report provides authority, as provided in the House, but not the Senate bill, for State Department special agents to make arrests and carry firearms as they discharge their duties. The Senate accepted House provisions for the protection of foreign missions.

We have in this conference report a requirement that the Secretary of State increase his efforts to negotiate updated extradition treaties relating to narcotics offenses.

The conference report also contains information on such issues as an earmark for expenses associated with certain games for the handicapped, such as the Special Olympics—referred to the statement of the managers, because of a typographical error, as the "Senior Olympics", games organized by the National Handicapped Sports and Recreation Association, and other important international events sporting events, such as the Pan American Games, to be held in Indianapolis, IN, in 1987.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also includes provisions providing for a scholarship program aimed at disadvantaged students from developing countries to study in the United States. The committee has found that under present arrangements, an insufficient number of underprivileged students are reaching our shores for college study. The fact is that many of the bright, but disadvantaged, to manage to reach positions of influence in their home countries. The bulk of such students are now coming to the Soviet Union for their university studies. We should be making opportunities available for all sorts of individuals to come and study here, and the conference substitute, which tracks a provision of the House foreign aid bill, does just that.

The bill contains compromise language on the degree to which Japan is currently meeting its obligation to defend the West. I think it is unfortunate that the Congress now singles out just one of many of our allies who may be lacking in some respect, in our view,

with respect to their contributions to the defense of the West. It is possible that this language may be counterproductive in our efforts to continue to engage Japan in constructive discussions on the efforts they may make in the future, and perhaps does not sufficiently recognize the efforts that have been made up to this point by the Japanese Government under the leadership of Prime Minister Nakasone. I would not want the language of the bill or the report to be misinterpreted in Japan as indicating anything near widespread dissatisfaction with the Japanese effort. I think that the Japanese effort may be misunderstood, but is substantial and increasing. It is possible that the report called for in this bill, while perhaps singling out one of the allies unjustly, will make it easier for the American people, and the Congress, to see just how well Japan is doing, and laying some fears to rest, while allowing us to concentrate on the areas in which more progress might be needed.

Mr. Speaker, while this legislation is highly complex and technical, and it is not by any means glamour legislation, it is necessary for the operation of the American foreign policy machinery. Moreover, it contains certain items by which the Congress has been able to express its will on important policy matters. I congratulate once again the Members and staff who have worked so hard on the legislation and urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of concern by a number of members of the border caucus with respect to the original language contained in the measure mandating to the State Department that a travel advisory be issued for the state of Jalisco in Mexico, and certainly I wanted to have the gentleman from Florida respond, if he would, as to what the language now contains and what the intent of the committee is.

Mr. MICA. Essentially, the language now has gone from a mandatory travel advisory to a recommendation to the Secretary of State to issue a travel advisory if he deems so appropriate.

The Secretary is also required every 90 days to supply a report to the Congress on the progress made on this situation.

I might indicate that I am fully aware of the sensitivity of this issue, and that was addressed by the conferees in attempting to make a recommendation, as they would with any

country that they have some concerns that there might be a problem with.

Our comment from the State Department was, No. 1, they welcome this recommendation; No. 2, they will give us comment as to the Secretary's feelings as to how far Mexico has gone to comply with our desires in this particular case.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. And I would just reiterate that it is up to the Secretary of State to make that determination rather than the Congress.

Mr. MICA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. I thank the gentleman. I want to just tell the gentleman that I very much appreciate the fact that this committee has worked with our caucus.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and want to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], and the border caucus for their efforts to combat narcotics trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the gentleman's concern about the Mexican trade advisory issue. We have addressed that issue with the Secretary of State and have been informed that the Department of State does not feel at this time that the conditions in Mexico warrant the imposition of a travel advisory. The Department further advises that information on the Camerena and other disappearance cases have been provided to the State Department and is presently available to the Congress, and that the State Department is continuing monitoring the safety of our citizens in all countries and issues travel advisories as warranted. The State Department notes that the Mexican Government is fully aware of the concerns of the Congress in regard to this issue and has taken additional steps to improve the safety of Americans in Mexico.

I might add that both our Foreign Affairs Committee and the Select Committee on Narcotics are closely monitoring developments with regard to the narcotics issue in Mexico.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate the language of the committee and the work it has done in this area.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BONKER].

Mr. BONKER. I thank the chairman for yielding. I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] and the ranking minority Member [Ms. SNOWE] for a really extraordinary task of resolving the 90-some issues in this authori-

zation bill, and actually being able to accomplish it without a formal session of the conferees. We are proud of the efforts that were made and the final product.

I think the chairman understands my disappointment with respect to the conferees' decision which in effect will allow the appointment of Defense Department personnel as part of the U.S. permanent delegation at Cocom in Paris, but I am pleased to see that our language on Intelsat, as we amended the bill in the House, has remained intact. I want to note that this Intelsat language, of course, will supersede any report language by any other committee of this body.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. BONKER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. I would just like to say, for the record, with regard to the Cocom issue, my disappointment is as strong and as great as the gentleman's, and I cannot tell him how much I am concerned about it. I expect to pursue this directly and hope the gentleman will join me with the Secretary of State as soon as we complete this legislation.

Mr. BONKER. I appreciate the chairman's comments and his support of our efforts to see that the State Department be retained as our representative of the U.S. delegation at Cocom.

Mr. Speaker, as we today consider the conference report on H.R. 2068, the State Department authorization bill, I would like to call to my colleagues attention two important issues in this legislation.

The decision of the conferees to allow the appointment of Defense Department personnel to the U.S. permanent delegation at Cocom—the international coordinating committee on multilateral export controls located in Paris—is a serious setback for U.S. foreign policy interests in general, and American exporters, specifically. Amid intense administration lobbying and at the insistence of the Senate majority conferees, a House provision to retain the State Department as the single U.S. voice at Cocom was deleted from the final legislation. That action also permits \$2 million of Defense Department funds to be used for the expansion of the Cocom facilities.

Although the Secretary of State retains the legal authority to represent the United States at Cocom, it will now be most difficult for the State Department to exercise that responsibility. Defense Department personnel alone will outnumber diplomatic representatives, and other U.S. departments and agencies will now demand permanent representation at Cocom comparable to the Defense Department's presence. This loss of control by the State Department will cause interagency disagreements on export

control policy previously settled in Washington to erupt in Paris, confusing and irritating our allies who participate with us in controlling the export of advanced technologies through the Cocom process. Any semblance of unity in U.S. policy and negotiating positions will be lost. This has happened all too often in the past, when various departments and agencies sent mere advisors to Cocom. It will be a far more serious problem with them permanently represented there. The net effect of this multi-agency permanent U.S. delegation can only be less U.S. effectiveness, thereby weakening multilateral export control efforts at a time when they are the most critically needed.

I intend to continue my efforts to achieve unity and efficiency in U.S. export control administration by restoring exclusive State Department representation on U.S. positions at Cocom. I will reintroduce my amendment shortly as a separate bill, and look for a legislative vehicle to send that provision to the President's desk as soon as possible.

In the meantime, the American business community should make no mistake about it—the administration, stretching to the maximum extent possible its discretionary authorities under the Export Administration Act, has turned over the U.S. export control system to the Department of Defense. This militarization of the Cocom process has been done unilaterally, in violation of the rule of consensus that governs Cocom. No other Cocom nation has appointed military personnel to its permanent delegation at Cocom, and no common policy to do so has been adopted by Cocom.

I predict the practical effect of these developments will be greater delays and rejections of the more than \$10 billion in proposed U.S. exports which must clear Cocom each year. These obstacles will occur from broader export controls insisted upon by the Defense Department officials, and from retaliation against U.S. export control demands.

The responsibility for these developments and the damage to U.S. trade, which I believe will be severe, now rests squarely on the shoulders of the Reagan administration and the senior majority members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Banking Committee who insisted on this action. U.S. companies, large and small, encountering problems at Cocom with their export licenses should hereafter address their complaints and appeals for help to those who have given the Defense Department the controlling hand in U.S. export control policy.

On the issue of U.S. telecommunications satellite policy, Congress in this legislation establishes a clear and definitive statutory basis for U.S. policy

initially prescribed by the Communications Satellite Act of 1962. The legislation commands U.S. support for competition in international satellite service, to the extent that this competition does not prevent Intelsat's global network from serving the unifying aims laid down in the 1962 act.

The legislation accomplishes two principal objectives. First, it codifies in statute Presidential Determination No. 85-2, and the conditions established thereunder by Secretary of State Shultz and Secretary of Commerce Baldrige. This determination provides that, in order to meet our international obligations and to avoid significant economic harm to Intelsat, U.S. sponsored separate international satellite systems must be coordinated with Intelsat pursuant to article XIV(d) of the Intelsat Agreement, and must be limited to providing private, customized telecommunications services. They must not be interconnected to public, switched networks. As indicated in the Statement of Managers, the Congress anticipates that the President will review Determination No. 85-2 from time to time, to see if its terms continue to serve the aims of protecting the viability of Intelsat and ensuring an efficient and responsive telecommunications system, as well as other U.S. interests, and, further, that he will recommend to the Congress any changes he finds may be necessary.

Second, the legislation assures U.S. support for an amendment to the Intelsat Agreement, article V(d), necessary to ensure that Intelsat has the tools to compete in the new competitive environment that the United States is taking the lead in establishing. Such an amendment must authorize Intelsat in exceptional circumstances to establish cost-based charges for individual traffic routes. Without such an amendment, Intelsat could be artificially constrained from meeting competition. The terms of this important provision in the conference report, which was much discussed when the legislation was on the House floor in May, are virtually identical to the original House version. Its substance is unaltered: The Secretary of State has discretion in determining the scope and character of an appropriate amendment, but he must support amending article V(d) to confer, in meaningful form, the authority for Intelsat to establish cost-based rates for individual routes.

In this regard, I would note that certain language touching on this issue appears in the Statement of Managers of the Conference Report on the fiscal 1985 supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 2577. This report language would appear to make U.S. support for an amendment to article V(d) contingent upon the absence of a Presidential de-

termination that such an amendment is not in the national interest. Such language, similar to language offered and rejected while H.R. 2068 was before the House, was also offered and also rejected in connection with the conference. It is inconsistent with a basic purpose and the express provisions of this legislation. As mere report language, is overridden by it. I understand that there are other provisions of this report language which could be construed to make U.S. support for an appropriate amendment to article V(d) discretionary or contingent. These are likewise superseded by the adoption of this bill.

In addition to the above provisions taken from the House bill, the conferees reported a new subsection c(2). This subsection, to ensure that rates by Intelsat are cost-based, the Secretary of State after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission shall instruct Comsat, the U.S. signatory to Intelsat's Operating Agreement, to ensure that significant documentation is provided by Intelsat to verify that such rates are in fact cost-based. As explained by the Statement of Managers, the new subsection also provides that the Government shall see that such documentation is made available to interested parties on a timely basis. This new subsection does not necessarily contemplate the provision of any further information by Intelsat to Comsat or the U.S. Government than is now routinely provided. Comsat, as a holder of 23 percent of the voting power on Intelsat's Board of Governors, has immediate access to all information about Intelsat's revenues and costs, and the basis for its charges, and such information is promptly made available to the U.S. Government by Comsat.

I should emphasize that the limitations in the new subsection on disclosure and dissemination of Intelsat financial information are intentional and very important. In particular, the less precise and less carefully delimited provisions in the report of the fiscal 1985 supplemental appropriations conference report—providing for the "release" of such information, and providing for disclosure of information about "allocation of costs" as well as information about "revenues and costs"—are overridden by the legislation now before the House. Such provisions were offered and specifically rejected in connection with the conference on H.R. 2068.

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, I introduced H.R. 3043, to require the Secretary of State to promulgate regulations which would, for the first time, allow the United States to monitor and control improper or illegal activities of certain employees of the U.S. Secretariat.

This legislation was introduced as a free-standing bill because the State Department authorization bill had already been considered in the House and because intelligence authorizations were considered under a restricted rule. Fortunately, Senator WILLIAM V. ROTH, of Delaware, successfully offered nearly identical language as an amendment to State authorizations in the other body. The goal of H.R. 3043 was to draw attention to this serious problem and to assist House conferees to accept this important language.

Our colleague, Mr. RUDN of Arizona, pointed out the report of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Senate Print 99-52, reveals a relentless abuse of the U.N. personnel system and unrestricted travel by Soviet and other employees of the Secretariat. This House will lose a great friend of freedom when the gentleman from Arizona leaves this body. He, more than many of us, saw the pressing need to control the information hemorrhage to the enemies of freedom caused by this egregious loophole.

I wish to commend the 40 bipartisan cosponsors who have joined me in sponsoring H.R. 3043. And I particularly commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. FASCELL of Florida; the ranking Republican member of Foreign Affairs, Mr. BROOMFIELD of Michigan; the chairman and ranking Republican of the Subcommittee on International Operations, Mr. MICA of Florida and Ms. SNOWE of Maine for their assistance in preserving the other body's language with technical amendments as contained in H.R. 3043. Of course, I also salute the other conferees for addressing this pressing problem.

It is my hope that the Secretary of State will work closely with interested Members of Congress, the intelligence community, and individuals vitally concerned with drug smuggling so as to effectively apply stringent standards to those few United Nations employee who have exploited their privilege of living in the United States to break our laws and raid information sources.

Section 141 of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2068 is a major breakthrough and is a shining example of bipartisanship and cooperation between both Houses of Congress.

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I go on record today as being opposed to the outrageously high level of funding authorized in the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act authorizations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987.

It is unconscionable that Congress should vote nearly \$13 billion in foreign assistance at a time when our own citizens are being asked to bear the brunt of domestic spending cuts, many of which will affect the elderly and youths seeking an education. We owe

it to our senior citizens to keep the promises made to them in the past, and yet I constantly receive letters from members of this community which urge me to vote for measures which would entail considerable sacrifice on their part in order to reduce the escalating national debt. These people understand that we cannot continue to spend vast amounts in excess of revenues without risking bankruptcy.

Furthermore, it is deplorable to note that half the amount authorized is earmarked for military aid, rather than economic or development assistance. All countries, with the possible exception of one, need humanitarian and economic aid, not our security assistance, in the amounts we send.

Please understand that I am not insensitive to the plight of many of our allies, who are threatened with either vast social problems or the imminent threat of totalitarian aggression. I am, however, suggesting that we must first put our own house in order, lest we shortly find ourselves in a position where we are powerless to help ourselves, let alone the rest of the world. ●

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 350, nays 74, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

YEAS—350

| | | |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Ackerman | Bereuter | Broyhill |
| Addabbo | Berman | Bruce |
| Akaka | Bevill | Bryant |
| Anderson | Biaggi | Burton (CA) |
| Andrews | Bilirakis | Bustamante |
| Annunzio | Bliley | Byron |
| Anthony | Boehlert | Callahan |
| Applegate | Boggs | Chandler |
| Aspin | Boland | Clay |
| Atkins | Boner (TN) | Clinger |
| AuCoin | Bonior (MI) | Coats |
| Badham | Bonker | Cobey |
| Barnard | Borski | Coelho |
| Barnes | Bosco | Coleman (MO) |
| Bartlett | Boucher | Coleman (TX) |
| Bateman | Boxer | Collins |
| Bates | Breaux | Combest |
| Bedell | Brooks | Conte |
| Beilenson | Broomfield | Conyers |
| Bennett | Brown (CA) | Cooper |

Coughlin
Courtner
Coyne
Crockett
Daniel
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Dyren
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Eckert (NY)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fasell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fiedler
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Franklin
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Gregg
Grotberg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Heftel
Henry
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Huckaby
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jeffords
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)

Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Lundine
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Mollinari
Mollohan
Moore
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrázek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Quillen

Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Sabo
Savage
Saxton
Scheuer
Schneider
Schuette
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Silkorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wyllie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NAYS—74

Archer
Arney
Barton
Bentley
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Chapple
Cheney
Coble
Craig
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Dreier
English
Evans (IA)
Fields
Frenzel
Gekas
Hansen
Hartnett
Hendon

Hertel
Hubbard
Hughes
Hunter
Jacobs
Jenkins
Jones (OK)
Kanjorski
Kindness
Latta
Luken
Langren
Martin (IL)
McCandless
McEwen
Monson
Montgomery
Moorhead
Nielsen
Pashayan
Penny
Petri
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer

Rogers
Rudd
Russo
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shumway
Shuster
Slatery
Smith (NH)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Solomon
Spence
Stenholm
Strang
Stump
Swindall
Walker
Watkins
Weaver
Weber
Whittaker

NOT VOTING—9

Alexander
Carr
Chappell

Crane
Garcia
Hefner

Kemp
Loeffler
Moody

□ 1310

Messrs. HANSEN, RUDD, and JENKINS changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DICKINSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 286, the vote on the conference report on the State Department authorization, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

CORRECTING ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 2068, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1986 AND 1987

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 181) to correct the enrollment of the bill H.R. 2068, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 181

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2068) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

(1) At the end of title I of the bill, after section 154, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 155. SOVIET AND INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST BEHAVIOR.

"Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary of State shall prepare and transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, an unclassified report on the advisability of establishing a permanent office in the Department of State to study Soviet and international Communist behavior that violates the concepts of national sovereignty and peace between nations. In conducting the study required by this section, the Secretary may make use of suitably qualified journalists and scholars."

(2) In the table of contents contained in section 1(b), after the item relating to section 154, insert the following new item:

"Sec. 155. Soviet and international Communist behavior."

(3) In section 812(c), strike out "The President should submit" and insert in lieu thereof "The President shall submit".

(4) In section 813(b), strike out "It is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of State and the Attorney General should" and insert in lieu thereof "The Secretary of State and the Attorney General shall" and strike out "should transmit" and insert in lieu thereof "shall transmit".

(5) In section 151, amend subsection (c) to read as follows:

(c) REDUCTION IN CONTRIBUTION IF SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS NOT MADE.—If the Secretary of State determines pursuant to subsection (b) that substantial progress has not been made in correcting this practice, the United States shall thereafter reduce the amount of its annual assessed contribution to the United Nations by the amount of that contribution which is the United States proportionate share of the salaries of those international civil servants employed by the United Nations who are returning any portion of their salaries to their respective governments.

Mr. MICA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRAFICANT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 2068, just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

□ 1320

A POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] wishes to state a point of personal privilege, and the gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Doorkeeper's office issued the floor today report, and in this report, the integrity of myself and another member of the minority, I believe, was impugned because it stated that we were offering more than 100 dilatory and frivolous amendments to a very important piece of legislation, that being the pay equity bill, which is going to be debated later today, and I feel that is enough reason for a point of personal privilege.

I serve on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I have worked long and hard on this particular piece of legislation and proposed a number of amendments in committee, as well as a substitute. Along with my colleague, I considered it an affront when the majority party Doorkeeper indicated on the floor today that our amendments were frivolous and dilatory.

I have since talked with the Doorkeeper of the majority party, Mr. Molloy. He was very kind and said it was an error. We accept that, and we hope it does not happen in the future. Both sides should be respected in this body as far as their amendments are concerned, and I feel confident in the future that they will be.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], does not have a request for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

A POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise on a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will inquire, does the gentleman rise for the same reason as the previous one?

Mr. ARMEY. For the same reason, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is recognized.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], I think, explained the situation very well. I was offended by this language, and I did talk to the Doorkeeper and he, being the gentleman that he is, gave me an explanation. It was an error on their part.

Unfortunately, a member of his staff copied the exact language by which my amendments were described as "dilatory" and the amendments of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] as "dilatory and frivolous" from the Democrat Study Committee's morning report. Obviously, we cannot expect the Doorkeeper's staff to be responsible for such language as appears in the Democrat Study Committee's report, and I did indeed accept his apology. I think he was quite a gentleman about it. He gave us a full explanation.

I do not choose to take the entire hour that I have allotted for this discussion, for two reasons: first, although I am prepared to discuss each and every one of these amendments and demonstrate them not to be dilatory, I do not believe I need to explain that at this point. We will have ample opportunity to do that during the debate on the bill. The other reason is, if indeed I were to take that hour and delay the day's work and perhaps even preempt some bills from being brought to consideration today, that indeed would be dilatory, and I would not want to do that to this body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3011, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1986

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct any technical and grammatical errors in the engrossment of the bill H.R. 3011, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1460, ANTI-APARTHEID ACT OF 1985

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 251 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 251

Resolved, That all points of order against the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1460) to express the opposition of the United States to the system of apartheid in South Africa, and for other purposes, and against consideration of the conference report are hereby waived. The conference report shall be considered as having been read when called up for consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 251?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 349, nays 75, not voting 9, as follows:

(Roll No. 287)

YEAS—349

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| Ackerman | de la Garza | Hendon |
| Addabbo | Dellums | Henry |
| Akaka | Derrick | Hertel |
| Alexander | DeWine | Hill |
| Anderson | Dickinson | Hillis |
| Andrews | Dicks | Hopkins |
| Annunzio | Dingell | Horton |
| Applegate | DioGuardi | Howard |
| Aspin | Dixon | Hoyer |
| Atkins | Donnelly | Hubbard |
| AuCoin | Dorgan (ND) | Huckaby |
| Barnard | Dowdy | Hughes |
| Barnes | Downey | Hutto |
| Bateman | Duncan | Hyde |
| Bates | Durbin | Jacobs |
| Bedell | Dwyer | Jeffords |
| Bellenson | Dymally | Jenkins |
| Bennett | Dyson | Johnson |
| Bentley | Early | Jones (NC) |
| Bereuter | Eckart (OH) | Jones (OK) |
| Berman | Edgar | Jones (TN) |
| Bevill | Edwards (CA) | Kanjorski |
| Biaggi | Edwards (OK) | Kaptur |
| Billirakis | Emerson | Kasich |
| Bliley | English | Kastenmeier |
| Boehert | Erdreich | Kennelly |
| Boggs | Evans (IL) | Kildee |
| Boland | Fascell | Kindness |
| Boner (TN) | Fazio | Kleczka |
| Bonior (MI) | Feighan | Kolbe |
| Bonker | Fiedler | Kolter |
| Borski | Fish | Kostmayer |
| Bosco | Flippo | Kramer |
| Boucher | Florio | LaFalce |
| Boxer | Foglietta | Lagomarsino |
| Breaux | Foley | Lantos |
| Brooks | Ford (MI) | Leach (IA) |
| Broomfield | Ford (TN) | Lehman (CA) |
| Brown (CA) | Fowler | Lehman (FL) |
| Brown (CO) | Frank | Leland |
| Broyhill | Franklin | Lent |
| Bruce | Frenzel | Levin (MI) |
| Bryant | Frost | Levine (CA) |
| Burton (CA) | Fuqua | Lightfoot |
| Bustamante | Gallo | Lipinski |
| Byron | Garcia | Livingston |
| Campbell | Gaydos | Lloyd |
| Carney | Gejdenson | Long |
| Carper | Gekas | Lowery (CA) |
| Chandler | Gephardt | Lowry (WA) |
| Chappell | Gibbons | Luken |
| Clay | Gilman | Lundine |
| Clinger | Gingrich | Lungren |
| Coats | Glickman | MacKay |
| Coelho | Gonzalez | Madigan |
| Coleman (MO) | Goodling | Manton |
| Coleman (TX) | Gordon | Markey |
| Collins | Gradison | Marlenee |
| Conte | Gray (IL) | Martin (IL) |
| Conyers | Gray (PA) | Martin (NY) |
| Cooper | Green | Martinez |
| Coughlin | Gregg | Matsui |
| Courter | Guarini | Mavroules |
| Coyne | Gunderson | Mazzoli |
| Crockett | Hall (OH) | McCain |
| Daniel | Hamilton | McCloskey |
| Darden | Hatcher | McCurdy |
| Daschle | Hawkins | McDade |
| Daub | Hayes | McGrath |
| Davis | Heftel | McHugh |

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| McKernan | Richardson | Swift |
| McKinney | Ridge | Synar |
| McMillan | Rinaldo | Tallon |
| Meyers | Robinson | Tauke |
| Mica | Rodino | Tauzin |
| Mikulski | Roe | Thomas (CA) |
| Miller (CA) | Roemer | Thomas (GA) |
| Miller (OH) | Rose | Torres |
| Miller (WA) | Rostenkowski | Torricelli |
| Mineta | Roukema | Towns |
| Mitchell | Rowland (CT) | Trafficant |
| Moakley | Rowland (GA) | Traxler |
| Molinari | Roybal | Udall |
| Mollohan | Russo | Valentine |
| Moody | Sabo | Vander Jagt |
| Morrison (CT) | Savage | Vento |
| Morrison (WA) | Saxton | Visclosky |
| Mrazek | Scheuer | Volkmer |
| Murphy | Schneider | Walgren |
| Murtha | Schroeder | Walker |
| Myers | Schuetz | Watkins |
| Natcher | Schulze | Waxman |
| Neal | Schumer | Weaver |
| Nelson | Seiberling | Weber |
| Nichols | Sensenbrenner | Weiss |
| Nowak | Sharp | Wheat |
| O'Brien | Shelby | Whitehurst |
| Oakar | Sikorski | Whitley |
| Oberstar | Sisisky | Whittaker |
| Obey | Skelton | Williams |
| Olin | Slatery | Wilson |
| Ortiz | Slaughter | Wirth |
| Owens | Smith (FL) | Wise |
| Panetta | Smith (IA) | Wolf |
| Pease | Smith (NE) | Wolpe |
| Penny | Smith (NJ) | Wortley |
| Perkins | Snowe | Wright |
| Petri | Solarz | Wyden |
| Pickle | Spratt | Wyllie |
| Porter | St Germain | Yates |
| Price | Staggers | Yatron |
| Pursell | Stallings | Young (AK) |
| Rahall | Stark | Young (FL) |
| Rangel | Stokes | Young (MO) |
| Ray | Stratton | Zschau |
| Regula | Studds | |
| Reid | Sweeney | |

NAYS—75

| | | |
|---------------|------------|---------------|
| Archer | Hansen | Ritter |
| Armey | Hartnett | Roberts |
| Badham | Holt | Rogers |
| Bartlett | Hunter | Roth |
| Barton | Ireland | Rudd |
| Boulter | Latta | Schaefer |
| Burton (IN) | Leath (TX) | Shaw |
| Callahan | Lewis (FL) | Shumway |
| Chapple | Lott | Shuster |
| Cheney | Lujan | Siljander |
| Cobey | Mack | Skeen |
| Coble | McCandless | Smith (NH) |
| Combust | McCollum | Smith, Denny |
| Craig | McEwen | Smith, Robert |
| Dannemeyer | Michel | Snyder |
| DeLay | Monson | Solomon |
| Dornan (CA) | Montgomery | Spence |
| Dreier | Moore | Stangeland |
| Eckert (NY) | Moorhead | Stenholm |
| Evans (IA) | Nielson | Strang |
| Fawell | Oxley | Stump |
| Fields | Packard | Sundquist |
| Grotberg | Parris | Swindall |
| Hall, Ralph | Pashayan | Taylor |
| Hammerschmidt | Quillen | Vucanovich |

NOT VOTING—9

| | | |
|---------|------------|----------|
| Anthony | Hefner | Loeffler |
| Carr | Kemp | Pepper |
| Crane | Lewis (CA) | Whitten |

□ 1340

Mr. DANNEMEYER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the House agreed to consider House Resolution 251.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this rule would permit consideration of the conference report on H.R. 1460, the bill to express the opposition of the United States to the system of apartheid in South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House conference reports are privileged and are considered in the House under the hour rule with no amendments in order. In this instance, the conferees reached agreement on this matter just last night and the report was filed in the House this morning. This rule simply facilitates expeditious consideration of the conference report by waiving all points of order, including any point of order against consideration of the conference report. In addition, the rule provides that when the conference report is called up for consideration, it shall be considered as having been read.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I object to considering this rule at this time for the simple reason that Members do not have an opportunity to review the conference report. This rule waives all points of order against the conference report. Ordinarily, the Rules Committee specifies what points of order it is waiving. But this was brought up in the Rules Committee as an emergency matter, and on such short notice that the Parliamentarian did not have adequate time to determine just what provisions violate which rules.

We were told that there is a possibility this violates the scope rule for conference reports because this contains a sanction relating to the importation of uranium and coal that was not contained in either the House- or Senate-passed versions. Under House rules, a scope violation, if sustained on a point of order, would prevent the consideration of the conference report.

We are also told that there are non-germane provisions and a reappropriation provision in this conference report. We don't know any of this for sure because there was not time to thoroughly examine this bill before a rule was reported. And there certainly is not time for the House to learn what the conferees have done before it votes on this. This is no way to legislate. I urge defeat of this rule so that we can come back another day when we have a better idea of what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time so that I might be able to re-

spond if there are any comments the chairman would like to address to me.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I unavoidably missed the vote on the rule to bring up this resolution. If I had been here, of course I would have supported it.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that we are bringing up this measure under expeditious proceedings of the Rules of the House of Representatives. However, in light of the fact that this measure has been debated thoroughly by the House before and there is ample time allotted the rule and under the rules of the House for consideration of the measure, we would ask that the House proceed to adopt the rule and consider this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

□ 1350

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2577) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 6, 7, 14, 23, 29, 35, 41, 45, 51, 57, 63, 65, 70, 75, 77, 87, 91, 92, 102, 109, 121, 130, 131, 132, 147, 150, 153, 164, 166, 167, 168, 178, 180, 183, 194, 199, 200, 202, 203, 204, 211, 214, 230, 234, 235, 249, 257, 258, 260, 261, 272, 289, 299, 307, 330, and 340 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112 with an amendment as follows: After "legislation" at the end of the last sentence, insert: "except that this sentence shall not apply after May 15, 1986".

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment numbered 262 to the above-entitled bill.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R.
1460, ANTI-APARTHEID ACT OF
1985

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1460) to express the opposition of the United States to the system of apartheid in South Africa, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 251, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see prior proceedings of the House of today.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report that we are considering is an important conference report because, on its adoption, the Congress of the United States will be making a statement on behalf of the American people with regard to the deplorable situation in South Africa.

There are many ways to interpret legislative action. I just want to give my own. As far as the details of the conference report are concerned and the legislation that will be considered, as you know, the bill was overwhelmingly adopted in the House, went to the other body and at that time it did not seem that there would be any strong action taken, considering the nature of the bill that was passed in the other body.

But a series of unfortunate, but yet dramatic, events took place and the whole atmosphere changed and it became more important than ever for us to make the statement which we are making today in this bill to indicate our disassociation from the Government and the actions of the Government of South Africa.

While I recognize the limitations of economic sanctions or any kind of sanctions, I think it is proper to state that the legislation makes a moral statement that far exceeds any economic leverage, as important as economic leverage may be.

It is for that reason that I personally think that this conference report is vital and particularly appropriate at this time.

We must make it clear not only to that Government, but to the rest of the world that we are disassociating in the strongest possible way by taking this legislative action, imposing an economic sanction, to demonstrate our position.

I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. SOLARZ, The Black Caucus, the Members of the minority, my colleague, Mr. BROOMFIELD from Michigan and others who have worked very, very diligently in a real bipartisan effort to bring you a measure which all of us, or at least most of us can genuinely support even though I know there are earnest and sincere differences of opinion as to the value of such action, that is economic sanctions.

But I dare say even though there may be disagreement or maybe differences of opinion with respect to the value of economic sanctions in bringing about a change in another government, I think there can be absolutely no difference of opinion, I would submit, on the issue that now is the time for the American people to make this moral statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, join in offering my strong support for this bipartisan report that we have before us. We have what I call a very reasonable compromise, given the seriousness of the present situation in South Africa. While I originally opposed the House bill on this issue, much has happened in recent weeks that demands action by the House today.

I deplore the ongoing violence in South Africa and believe that sanctions are imperative and morally right. We must tell that government that America is concerned about the shameful system of apartheid in South Africa and the senseless bloodshed in that land. Pressure on South Africa cannot, however, be unilateral; we need the support of our allies if this effort is to succeed.

The report basically calls for immediate and weighty sanctions against the South African Government; Krugerrands, computers, nuclear goods, and bank loans would be affected. Additional sanctions are to be imposed in the future if no progress is made ending apartheid.

While sanctions by our country against South Africa are necessary, the cooperation of our allies in the effort is also essential and imperative. Pressure on the Government cannot be done by the United States alone. Over the years I have been a supporter of the policy of constructive engagement. That approach to our relations with South Africa has been useful and some progress has been made. The U.S. business in that country voluntarily complied with the provisions of the Sullivan code and South African blacks benefited from those efforts.

In recent months, however, the tension between groups in South Africa has increased and much senseless bloodletting has occurred. Something has to be done. I urge the Congress to pass this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only essential, I think it is morally right to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has consumed 2 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE].

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I think that the conference agreement that was reached last night was in many respects historic for this institution and for our country. I cannot tell you how proud I was personally as an American and as a Member of this institution to see House and Senate conferees, on a totally bipartisan basis, express a commitment to move in a new direction in our relationship toward South Africa. The conference agreement that was passed, a very creative and constructive agreement, will send to South Africans an unmistakable message that, henceforth, the United States will no longer enter into an accommodation with apartheid.

We are also signaling the South African regime that if the Afrikaners attempt to maintain the system of apartheid, and if they continue to manifest the repression and brutality that we have seen so much in evidence in recent days, that they will be increasingly isolated in their relationship to the United States and to the international community and they will experience increasing economic and political costs as a consequence of that repression and that brutality.

My colleagues, there is a terrible tragedy in the making in South Africa. Unless the international community joins with forces within that country that are seeking to eliminate the system of apartheid, a bloodbath will be inevitable.

□ 1400

The white minority regime will abandon apartheid, will agree to enter into negotiations with the credible black leadership of the majority of the population, only at that point when it concludes that it has more to lose than to gain by attempting to hold on to apartheid.

Throughout the debate on sanctions, those who have resisted the imposition of sanctions have argued that they will only hurt the black population. My colleagues, there is no argument that has been advanced in this debate that is more off target.

The reality is that it has been the current ambivalence of American policy which, on the one hand, verbally condemns apartheid but, on the other, practices business as usual that

has done more than anything else to compound the repression and to add to the violence. This is because the message that has been heard by the Afrikaners is that they indeed do have a free hand to do what they will. We have signaled them in advance that there was not going to be any response, no matter how repressive they became internally and no matter how aggressive they were in their actions toward their neighboring states.

Make no mistake about it: Blacks in South Africa are themselves engaging in a policy of economic pressure and economic sanctions. They are pursuing boycotts now throughout the country, not because they wish to inflict economic hardship upon the black majority, but because they understand that it is that economic pressure, both internally and externally, that represents the only hope to avoid a massive bloodbath in South Africa.

We are in this legislation beginning to send straight signals to the South African Government. We are letting them know in advance that this system of apartheid cannot be maintained indefinitely, and it is up to the Afrikaners to take steps now to enter into negotiations with the black majority to achieve a new political order in which all citizens of South Africa will indeed be citizens of their own country, and full participants in the political system of that country.

Let me say one other thing, Mr. Speaker. There are some very profound moral issues at stake, and that is why I was so proud of my colleagues last night. And I want to pay tribute to the Republican leadership as well as the Democratic leadership, to Mr. BROOMFIELD as well as Mr. FASCELL on our side, and to the Republican as well as Democratic leaders in the Senate, for their willingness to join together in a genuinely bipartisan way.

I cannot tell you how important that unity is in terms of what we are conveying to the South Africans and to the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to speak with one voice in voting to approve the conference report.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. CHALMERS WYLIE, a member of the conference committee and ranking member on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act.

The recent deterioration of events in South Africa lead me to the conclusion that the time is right to take stronger steps against the Government of South Africa. We do this with the fervent hope that our actions will aid all of the people in South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, other conferees more knowledgeable than I have and will address many important foreign policy aspects of this conference report. Since I was appointed as conferee on several sections because of my service as the ranking Republican member on the House Banking Committee, I will confine my remarks to the provisions under our jurisdiction.

First, the conferees adopted the House provision to immediately ban the importation of Krugerrands. The President may waive this ban if certain conditions are met as set forth in this conference report.

Second, the conferees agreed to a House amendment to the Senate provision which provided for the minting of U.S. gold coins to compete with the Krugerrand. This House amendment offered by my friend Mr. ANNUNZIO, the chairman of our Consumer Affairs and Coinage Subcommittee, creates four new gold coins which are both legal tender and have face values of \$50, \$25, \$10, and \$5. These coins truly will be American gold coins which should compete fiercely against the Krugerrand on the world markets. The significance of this coin is heightened by the symbols we will have on the 1-ounce gold coins; that is, a symbol of liberty on the obverse side and a family of American eagles on the reverse side.

The gold for these coins is to be acquired only from natural deposits in the United States or from the gold reserves held by the United States. All the profits from the sale of these coins are to be used for sole purpose of reducing the national debt.

Moreover, at my suggestion, Chairman ANNUNZIO graciously accepted language which states that the Secretary of the Treasury shall ensure that the minting of these gold coins will not result in any net cost to the U.S. Government.

In all fairness, I must tell my colleagues that the Treasury Department does not support these gold coins. Having said that, I have to believe that they will like the version adopted by the conferees more than the original Senate language, which provided for a legal tender coin without an assigned face value. In a letter to Senator JAKE GARN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, dated April 19, 1985, Mrs. Katherine Ortega, Treasurer of the United States, pointed out that the unprecedented nature of the Senate proposed coin was addressed by President Reagan's Gold Commission, on which I served, which stated that the legal tender status of such gold bullion coins "could compel their acceptance by private creditors for debts or by the Treasury for taxes. Formidable problems involving profits and losses to private creditors and debtors could arise in assigning gold coins

legal tender status at a fluctuating rate." Mrs. Ortega went on to say that a legal tender coin of the realm whose value would depend entirely upon the fluctuations of the precious metal market would represent a major departure from 200 years of coinage legislation.

I also should note that while nominal face values have been specified for the gold coins established by this act, the coins will be sold and traded at their market values. Specifically, I believe that the conferees meant to prohibit frivolous litigation based upon the disparity between face value and market value. Transactions, involving these coins will be valued at market, not face, value.

Clearly, this American gold coin will give people all over the world a chance to vote with their pocketbooks in favor of an American gold coin symbolizing liberty and freedom and against the abhorrent practice of apartheid in South Africa.

For those of my colleagues who are concerned that such a gold coin will reestablish a gold standard, let me assure you that this is not the case. We already have on the books a gold coin as part of the 1984 Olympics program, and earlier this year the Congress enacted a gold coin as part of the Statue of Liberty restoration effort. The gold coin in this legislation is no different from earlier Government coins authorized by this body. The face values of the proposed coins are nominal and unrelated to the market value of the coins. Their market value is determined by their content. Thus, the so-called \$50 piece, which contains 1 troy ounce of fine gold, would be worth about \$328 at the current price of gold.

Moreover, the bill expressly provides for the sale of these coins at a price equal to the market value of the gold content of the coins, plus markup for production and marketing. The dollar value of the coin, therefore, is determined by world gold market—demand and supply—conditions, not by a conversion ratio between a specified quantity of gold and paper dollars fixed by U.S. public authorities.

As I read the amendment, it is not, therefore, inconsistent with the findings of the President's Gold Commission.

Section 15 of this report prohibits loans to the South African Government or to any corporation owned or controlled by that Government. Certain loans for educational, health, and housing facilities to help the people of South Africa are exempted. These provisions were contained in both House and Senate versions of the legislation.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, there is language in this report which instructs the Export-Import Bank to take active steps to encourage the use of its pro-

grams by Africans. While not affecting the present restrictions on Eximbank transactions for South Africa, this provision will make it possible for non-white businesses to get Eximbank assistance.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this conference report. It is a timely step for this Nation to take in protest of the repugnant racial policies of South Africa.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the conference report, and I want to commend the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. FASCELL], Mr. BROOMFIELD, and the other members of both sides of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for the outstanding job that they have done in bringing this legislation to the floor.

As you know, this legislation contains a ban on the sale of Krugerrands. It also contains provisions for the striking of a new series of U.S. gold coins, which I predict will become the most popular gold coins in the world.

Under the compromise legislation, four gold coins will be minted; a 1-ounce gold coin having a face value of \$50, a 1/2-ounce gold coin having a face value of \$25, a 1/4-ounce gold coin having a face value of \$10 and a 1/10-ounce gold coin having a face value of \$5. These coins will be legal tender.

The other body included in its legislation provisions for the gold coins, but did not assign face values or make the coins legal tender. Without such distinctions, the coins are really not coins, but medallions; or if you will, merely pieces of jewelry. But by assigning the coins value and making them legal tender, we make them much more attractive to the numismatic and investment communities. Experts around the country have told me that without legal tender face value the new U.S. coins would not sell.

While the Krugerrand does not have a face value and is quasi-legal tender, it should be noted that in recent months the sale of Krugerrands in this country has plummeted. The most popular gold piece now is the Canadian Maple Leaf, which does have a face value and is legal tender. More than three times the number of Maple Leafs are now being sold in this country compared to Krugerrands.

Not only will the new U.S. gold coins take away sales from Krugerrands, but if and when the situation in South Africa is stabilized and that country becomes a member of the international humanitarian world, the United States' coins will still be big sellers be-

cause of their legal tender status and face value requirements.

The compromise legislation further provides that rather than limiting private distribution and sales rights to a single concern, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make bulk sales at suitable discounts to any dealers, retail outlets, financial institutions, or anyone else who wants to sell the coins. Of course, the size of the discount will be determined by the number of coins purchased.

The compromise legislation also requires that the profits from the sale of these coins be used to retire the national debt. This is an important provision because I think it is the first time in the history of our Government that we will have an ongoing program to retire the national debt. While I have sponsored legislation in the past that would call for a one-time contribution to retire the national debt, such as the proceeds from the George Washington commemorative coin, my new national debt reduction program will go on as long as gold coins are produced. And I would add, there is no such cutoff in the legislation.

The contribution to retire the national debt could be substantial. And depending on the source of the gold used for the coins, the national debt reduction could reach as high as \$300 per coin—a significant amount when you consider that other gold coins are selling in the millions in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the members of the House Banking Committee who served as conferees on the gold coin provision; particularly the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. NEAL] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE.] It is significant that both of these gentlemen were members of the Presidential Gold Commission, and both members supported strongly the legislation before us in this conference report.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MITCHELL,] who throughout the conference was a champion of the new gold coin program, and who made one of the most eloquent speeches in that conference, on the evils of apartheid, that I have heard in my 21 years in Congress.

The issuance of these coins would have no effect on the Nation's monetary policy. The coins would be legal tender for their face value, like all U.S. coins. But since the bullion content of the coins is well above the face value of the coins, the coins will not circulate. This is the same approach taken by Canada in issuing its "Maple Leaf," a 1-ounce gold bullion coin, which has a \$50 face value. That coin has been a popular bullion coin, and has had no adverse effect on Canadian monetary policy.

These coins will be handled the same way the public now treats the gold coins previously issued by the

United States. Gold coins issued in the 19th and early 20th century are still legal tender and will be redeemed for their face value by the United States. None are ever presented for redemption however, since the coins' intrinsic bullion value are far in excess of their face value. The marketplace, not the face value, will determine their actual value as they are bought and sold in the public domain.

In fact, if a gold coin was presented to the United States for redemption, it would be a windfall for the Government. The coin, which would have been sold to the public for its bullion value, would be repurchased for its far lower face value. It could then be resold to the public at its bullion price.

Unlike some legal tender bullion coins issued by some other countries, the fixed legal tender value of the coins eliminates any problem of valuation. For legal tender purposes the coins are worth the value stamped on them, regardless of the value of their bullion content. This not only avoids valuation problems in the unlikely event they are used as legal tender, but solves the problem of how to account for them for measuring the amount of money in circulation. Simple multiplication of the number issued by the face value provides the answer.

The legislation would not deplete our gold reserves. The gold for the coins would be obtained in the same manner that gold used in U.S. commemorative coins is obtained. The gold could come from stocks already held by the Treasury. If the Secretary preferred, the gold could be purchased on the open market. The determination whether to use existing stocks or to purchase additional gold would be left to the Secretary, just as current law provides. There would be no change in the Secretary's authority to maintain the U.S. gold stocks at the level deemed appropriate.

The coins will be sold to the public at a price equal to the market value of the gold or silver at the time of sale, plus the cost of minting, marketing, and distribution.

In order to provide the mint with ample time to prepare to mint and issue the coins, no coins could be sold before October 1, 1986. However, the mint could begin work on the program on October 1, 1985. This will provide sufficient leadtime to develop outstanding designs for the coins, design an appropriate and effective distribution system and mint sufficient coins for an initial inventory.

The coin program will involve no net cost to the Government. Indeed, the revenues raised by the domestic and foreign sale of these coins will constitute substantial revenue to the United States that will be used solely to reduce the national debt. And the

availability of U.S. gold bullion coins will surely attract precious-metals buyers formerly dependent on foreign issues.

Over \$500 million can be generated each year by the sale of U.S. bullion coins. At the current gold price of \$327 per ounce the United States would realize a gain of \$285 per ounce since the gold is carried on the books at \$42.22 per ounce. If sales of gold coins were to average only 2 million ounces annually, a figure that is very reasonable, the United States would realize a gain of \$570 million. In a situation where even the smallest saving would strike a blow against the deficit, these earnings would be a major contribution.

The minting of these new American coins will aid in reducing our record trade deficits. The Commerce Department has estimated that over 1 billion dollars' worth of foreign gold bullion coins were imported into the United States in 1984.

Most Americans would prefer to purchase U.S. coins and this legislation will provide the coins they seek. Every year, countless individuals contact the Consumer Affairs and Coinage Subcommittee asking for the United States to produce gold bullion coins. Many, if not all, of these individuals will buy an American gold bullion coin rather than a foreign bullion coin. Indeed, the coins are likely to become the standard by which all other bullion coins are measured.

I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], who is a member of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would say that there is unanimity in this Chamber and in this Congress as far as the opposition to the policy of apartheid in South Africa is concerned. Nobody likes that form of government; the racial repression that exists; we would all like to see that change.

My problem with this legislation is not that it attacks the policy of apartheid which we all abhor, but that it goes so far as to hurt the very people that it purports to help.

□ 1410

In addition to that, I think it bodes ill, in the long run, for the free world.

I would like to tell why on those two points.

First of all, banning the Krugerrand. If the free world all joins together in banning the Krugerrand, a lot of black people who work in the mines are going to lose their jobs. There are about 600,000 blacks who work in the gold mines of South Africa today. Each one of those people is responsible for feeding five other human

beings. That is 3 million people who would be adversely affected if the mines were shut down.

If this legislation is passed here, and around the world the other free governments follow suit, many thousands of people are going to lose their jobs. They are not going to be able to put food on the table. The very people we want to help. Now, those people are going to be ripe for revolution. They are going to be grasping for existence, and the people who are Marxists over there, the revolutionaries who do exist and who are trying to undermine a number of governments in Africa, in addition to South Africa, are going to have their way with a lot of them. And those people are going to be very active in trying to change the governmental structure over there from what it is to a Marxist form of government.

What if that happens? If that happens, Mr. Speaker, in my view you would have, in just a matter of days or weeks, Soviet ships in those ports. What does that mean? Forty percent of the free world oil supplies go around the Cape of Good Hope, the southern tip of Africa. And if the Soviets controlled the southern tip of Africa in a time of crisis, they could hamstring the free world as far as energy is concerned. Our NATO allies, Britain, France, all of the NATO allies, would be in jeopardy, as well as the United States of America, because many of our oil supplies come around the Cape of Good Hope as well.

In addition to that, you will see up here a number of charts that I have brought out for argument. I would like to explain what they mean. Many of the minerals that are depicted on these charts are vital to the survival of the United States of America. Platinum is one. We get 49 percent of our platinum from South Africa. Chromium, we get 55 percent of our chromium from South Africa. Manganese, we get 39 percent of our manganese from South Africa. Cobalt, 61 percent of our cobalt comes from Zimbabwe and Zaire to the United States of America, but it comes through South Africa. And 44 percent of vanadium comes through South Africa.

These minerals are vital to the military security and economic health of this country. Now, if the Soviet Union gets control of South Africa, it is going to hurt, or if one of the U.S.S.R. surrogates gets control, it is going to hurt severely the United States of America and may threaten the very existence of the free world.

You may say, "Well, what about the Soviet Union, are they dependent upon South Africa or the African Continent for their existence?"

If you look at this chart here, the second chart, it shows that the U.S.S.R. is almost independent as far as their needs are concerned. They have these minerals within the con-

finances of the U.S.S.R. The only exception that they really have to worry about is cobalt, and they get the majority of their supply of cobalt from Cuba, one of their satellite countries.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are a lot of problems with this legislation. One of the problems, as I stated before, is the impact on the people we want to help, the blacks. But in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I think there is a real risk, a real long-term risk to the free world.

Many of my colleagues have stood up here and they have said, "Well, we have to show moral leadership, the free world has to get involved, and we have to do something about it."

I agree with that. But how far do we go? We went pretty far in a country called Rhodesia. We stopped buying chromium from Rhodesia. The Soviet Union became the only market we had, and we were buying chromium produced in Rhodesia from the Soviet Union after it became Zimbabwe, and we were paying three times the price. Imagine what it would do to us if we had to deal with them on the same basis with these other vital minerals. And, of course, you have seen what happened to Zimbabwe since they have gone Communist. The Government is headed back toward the dark ages and not into the future like it had been previously. They have a very repressive Government. Blacks are preying upon blacks. There is blood running in the streets. Now they have a one-party totalitarian Communist government. I submit to you if we follow the same train of thought that we followed in Zimbabwe, we are going to have the same thing in South Africa.

We stuck our nose into Iran, as did many other free world countries, talking about the repression over there. We got rid of the Shah all right, but look what we got in his place. The Ayatollah Khomeini.

We need to do something about the apartheid policies of South Africa; we need to put pressure upon this Government. But not the way we are talking about it in this piece of legislation. If we do it, I think we are sowing the seeds of massive revolution in that country. There will be no constructive change in the Government. We run the risk of a Marxist takeover, and it is going to bode very ill, in my opinion, for the entire free world.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to commend the conferees for reporting out this piece of legislation, and I am glad the Congress has agreed to a package of economic sanctions against the apartheid regime in South Africa. Among the sanctions, as already has

been said, is a ban on the Krugerrands, which I think is very, very important, because I do not want to see citizens of the United States of America continue to buy these gold coins that are created by near-slave labor and human suffering. But even as I applaud the actions of the Congress I cannot help but feel that more should be done to protect against the crimes in South Africa. Since the imposition of the state of emergency just 11 days ago, over 25 people have been killed and over 1,200 arrested by the South African police.

Now, to add further insult to injury, the South African Government has also today, or recently, announced that they were going to prohibit outdoor funeral services for those who happened to die of unnatural causes. This law is testimony, I believe, to the brutal policies of the South African police. If Pretoria truly wishes to defuse the tensions that often accompany such funerals, they should stop supplying the corpses for the funerals.

In light of these terrible crimes, as I said before, we need to do a great deal more. I believe that one of the things we need to do is to call for disinvestment in South Africa. Total United States disinvestment in South Africa would provide the slap in the face that I believe South Africa needs, and I certainly would urge all of us to consider that in the very near future.

But before we reach for our calculators to come up with figures and graphs such as we have just seen on the board over there on the other side of the well, we need to examine the value of a human life; one live in dignity, in freedom, and in self rule. It is my belief that the value of a human life lived in dignity, lived in freedom, lived in self rule is far more important than the possibility of lost dollars from the sale of Krugerrands or from disinvestment. I think what we ought to join France's example of imposing strong sanctions and taking a hard line against the system of apartheid; and I strongly urge the passage of this conference report and its speedy signing by the President.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make three brief points: The first relates to strategic issues, the second to coinage, and the third to moral. Strategically, some argue that our Government shouldn't stand up for abstract moral points because moral posturing tends too frequently to undercut our strategic position. Actually, the problem in South Africa is the obverse. Failure to stand up for moral principles jeopardizes U.S. national security. After all, ending apartheid is the most important foreign policy issue to the rest of sub-Saharan

Africa, and these countries are in total more important than South Africa.

In addition, can there be any doubt that sometime in the not-too-distant future there will be majority rule in South Africa? Do we want to go down as the one country in the free world which, while paying lip service to anti-apartheid sentiments, is viewed in the region and in South Africa as conducting a policy legitimatizing the very government which established and maintained apartheid? If such a perception remains the case, can we be expected to count on maintaining access to all the strategic minerals the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] identified?

Regarding coinage, it must be stressed that banning the importation of Krugerrands and offering an American gold coin alternative is both a deficit reduction measure and good for our balance of payments. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] should be commended for their efforts to craft a new gold policy that does not imply return to the gold standard but allows the average American citizen, at his or her option, to purchase and save American gold with confidence.

Finally, and most importantly, with regard to the moral issues at stake in this bill, we should all understand that ending apartheid in this century is as great a social imperative as ending slavery in the last.

The Republican Party was born a little more than a century ago in the smoldering cradle of apartheid-like conditions. All we ask of this Republican President is that he advance a foreign policy consistent with the views of the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln.

Apartheid is an issue that can't be ignored. Its meaning is too great; its results too important.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MITCHELL], without whose efforts the conference would not have been successful.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to go on record as saying that in many years of service in this House, I will remember that conference committee as one of the finest opportunities and experiences that I have had as a member of the this legislative body.

I am not going to call the names. You know what you did. You rose to the occasion, and you did so magnificently. I am just profoundly grateful that I could be a part of that.

□ 1420

In every society, we have certain rules that operate. They can be called mores, folkways, laws, and customs. But in our society and in other societies, there is something that tran-

sends all of those things. That is called a moral imperative. That is what this legislation is, it is a moral imperative.

Those who would argue about possible political consequences down the line; those who would argue against the legislation in terms of the economic factor, forget, but were reminded by my colleague, that America took the high moral imperative when it took a position against slavery despite all those who counseled against taking that position.

They forget that time and time again we have taken a high moral position even though it might have had adverse political and economic circumstances, and that is what we have got. In this legislation we have got a moral imperative and this House must rise to the occasion and support.

There will always be those who will say the legislation is too weak or the legislation is too strong. I do not care about that. I know what I care about; I care about the courage of the conferees and the courage of this House in saying this is a moral imperative from which we will not back off; this is right for this Nation and its conscience.

Let me just say we have very few issues that we deal with in this House that transcend political partisanship. This is the one. This is the one real encounter this year, and I urge your total, total support for it.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am very proud to be in the House today. This is one of our finest hours. In the spirit of Lincoln, BILL BROOMFIELD, DANTE FASCELL, I think this is a great opportunity, and I hope and dear pray that the President of the United States signs this conference report.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, this Member was disappointed not to be able to vote for the bill to impose new sanctions against South Africa that was passed by the House of Representatives a few weeks ago. I simply felt it was not responsible to support one specific element of that bill.

Indeed, the only provision that I could not support and that compelled me to vote against the bill prohibits all investment, direct or indirect, in new or existing business enterprises in South Africa. While the case for these sanctions is persuasive to some, a compelling case can also be made against such sanctions. As the Washington

Post editorial said, "There is a serious, respectable, nonracist case against (this) sanction."

Last night, the conference committee resolved the differences between the two bills. The Houses agreed to impose a ban on the sale of Krugerrands in this country. The measure would also ban the sale of goods used in nuclear production and computers and bank loans to the South African Government. Dropped from the agreement was the House provision banning new investments in South Africa. Certainly I support the ban on the sale of Krugerrands because I believe prohibiting the sale of Krugerrands to be step of great symbolic and economic significance.

This will be one of this year's most important policy declarations by the United States of America. I urge the President to sign this legislation.

International pressure is rising against South Africa. France recently banned further investments in the country. The United Nations Security Council denounced the "barbarism" of apartheid, even though sanctions were vetoed. When White House Press Liaison Larry Speakes talked about American "repugnance," he reflected a general feeling in this country. With this resolution, the voice of the United States will be clearly heard in South Africa and in the world community. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. With the imposition of the state of emergency, the South African Government has escalated the barbarity of their oppression of the black majority of the country. Urgent and meaningful action is needed from all of the nations of the civilized world. The sanctions included in this conference report are far too weak, nevertheless, we welcome this report as an important first step which will send a timely message to the Government of South Africa. We hope the President will hasten to sign this measure into law.

It is still important to note, Mr. Speaker, that events in South Africa are escalating daily. More and more deaths are occurring and more and more arrests are being made. There is no reason to believe the figures being released by the South African Government. The number of deaths each day are far greater than the body count that is being officially listed. The number of arrests is also far greater. The occupation of the black townships by storm troopers is the first step toward the conversion of these isolated townships into deadly concentra-

tion camps. There is every reason to believe that millions will be slaughtered by the racist inhuman Government of South Africa unless there is more forceful action by the civilized world under the leadership of the United States.

For the second time in one century we do not want to witness the slaughter of millions of innocent human beings. Beyond the sanctions included in this report there must be more stringent sanctions including the prohibition of all new investment in South Africa. As a matter of U.S. policy our Government should also demand that South Africa immediately release Nelson Mandela and begin negotiation with Mandela who is the only recognized leader among all segments of the South African black population. The United States must also demand that South Africa immediately establish a timetable for the granting of full political rights to all South African blacks. The time for action is now. When Hitler was committing massive atrocities against the Jews most of the world pretended they didn't know it was happening. This time no nation can use that excuse. This time we know that new death camps are being prepared. This time we must all act before it is too late.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. Dishonesty and hypocrisy has reached a level unparalleled in the history of mankind in South Africa through the Botha regime's efforts to justify accelerated atrocities against the black majority in that rich country.

For those supporters of a policy of constructive engagement and opposing economic sanctions to have the audacity to say "it's out of our concern for the economic well being of blacks in South Africa" as a reason to oppose sanctions against the apartheid government by this great citadel of democracy is ludicrous, hypocritical, and dishonest.

A position in this respect bolsters the threats by the Botha government to fire people who join and support the fight for freedom, both economic and political. Anyone who has any knowledge of the history and growth of South Africa's apartheid regime must know and acknowledge the fact that current South African economic growth did not result from concern for the well being of the black majority, most of whom had jobs that the whites would not perform because of their laborious nature and low pay. Furthermore, the jobs were too few in number.

Who's kidding who? Release those social, political, and economic hostages

who outnumber their legalized captors better than 4 to 1.

With respect to support for sanctions, we can reemploy some of our laid-off workers in the automobile, steel, and coal industries who have lost their jobs as a result of plant close-downs and United States investments in South Africa.

We can not longer continue down the failed path of President Reagan's constructive engagement. I urge my colleagues to vote for the conference report on H.R. 1460 as a step toward the end of world recognized injustice in South Africa.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in 1978, I think it was October 1978, I rose on this floor to speak in favor of censuring the Government of South Africa, and I voted to censure South Africa at that time.

Now, we are told that since that time there has been progress in that country. I will not deny there has been some progress, but that progress has been minimal, and that progress has been largely cosmetic.

Some of my friends seem to have a strange attachment to South Africa. South Africa for some reason in their minds rises to the status of special friend. Mr. Speaker, no nation which represses its citizens and denies basic human freedoms is a friend of mine or of the principles on which this country was founded. There must be no more rationalizations. If what is happening in South Africa does not stir moral outrage, what will?

This is not an economic issue. Communist revolutions do not come from the granting of basic human freedoms. No Member of this House should vote against this resolution.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I rise in support of H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act, and H.R. 2068.

Under the system of apartheid millions of South Africans have been forcefully removed from their homes and families to areas called homelands. Blacks earning only a fraction of what whites earn in the workplace—attempts to unionize being met with imprisonment—these are only a few examples of the uncivilized ways in which the South African Government treats the majority of its population who are blacks.

In the past several weeks the protests of blacks have been met with violence on the part of the South African Government. Thousands of blacks

have been arrested including children as young as 8 years of age.

The bloodshed must stop. The South African Government is unwilling to meet with black civil rights leaders. Constructive engagement has not worked as a means of dealing with the South African Government. Institutionalized racism still exists and less than half of the U.S. corporations doing business in South Africa have voluntarily signed the Sullivan principles.

H.R. 2068 and H.R. 1460 will send a clear message to the Government of South Africa, and to the rest of the world, that the United States clearly will not tolerate their antihumanistic, racist, apartheid policies.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY].

Mr. FAUNTROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, first of all, to commend members of the conference on both sides of the aisle for having quizzed themselves so well, valiantly contending for the stronger measure passed by the House.

At this point, I am already looking beyond 1460, because I am confident that the Members of this House who voted for that stronger measure are going to support this as a means of sending a message to South Africa.

I am looking beyond it because when we voted on this measure back in June, no state of emergency had been established in South Africa, and 1,300 people to date have not been arrested without charge and without recourse; 25 people have not been killed as a result of that emergency.

□ 1430

Those who had been accustomed to at least providing those victims of racist, Nazi, Fascist oppression had not been denied the right to bury them in public funerals, nor had we the moral leadership which we sought to exert seized by France, and saying that we would do what the House proposes to do without delay.

So I am hopeful that as we pass this measure that we look to stronger indications to the South African Government that we will no longer cooperate with their blind march toward racism, violence, bloodshed, and ultimately destruction, but will reward them when they turn up the road toward true democracy, toward dialog, and toward full self-determination.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SILJANDER], the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. SILJANDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the violence in South Africa must stop. The bloodshed of innocent people, blacks against blacks,

whites against blacks, it must stop. I, as one Member, feel that we, as the greatest Nation on the Earth, a great and free democracy that holds up high the symbols of truth and fairness and liberty and justice, that we should do all we can do, and we have a responsibility to do all we can do to encourage those who are under oppression in other countries to be released.

We call on the Government of South Africa to release the majority to become part of the political and economic and social system fully in that country. We call upon the apartheid racist regime to cease and desist in their pass laws, detention laws, and all the other apartheid laws that made that country an abomination of human rights and freedom.

All of the messages in Congress, be it the House bill, the Senate version, the conference committee report, several substitutes offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ZSCHAU], myself and others, we have all called for the dismantlement of apartheid. That concept is elementary.

I hope the Government of South Africa hears this message loudly and very, very clearly: That there is not one Member, white or black, young or old, who could possibly, by any remote stretch of the imagination, support a system that stabilizes the apartheid system in that country.

I have made the arguments against sanctions on the floor, in the subcommittee, in the full committee, and last night and through the day in conference, so I will not go through those same arguments again. I believe philosophically that sanctions are the wrong approach to prompt change in that nation. The grain embargo failed against the Soviets. Sanctions against Cuba failed, and indeed, I think the sanctions against Nicaragua will also fail. I believe that banning Krugers is merely symbolic, a symbolic gesture that they claim is against the Government, but truly it is against the people.

But I must say there are some good things about H.R. 1460, although I intend to vote against the bill. I offered mandatory Sullivan principles as an option to sanctions. On the floor it has lost, but now, with enthusiasm, both the House and the Senate are adopting the same idea. I also proposed on the floor an amendment to make the U.S. Embassy in South Africa conform to the Sullivan principles. It passed this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SILJANDER] has expired.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SILJANDER. So that amendment is also included in this conference report.

Scholarships for black South Africans, assistance to black businesses, are also part of the Siljander substitute, which are also part of this conference report.

I think the major issue that I have found extremely offensive in the House version that passed this body was the fact that we banned all new business to South Africa. I did not believe that that would have been an effective deterrent of the apartheid system. That is the mainstay, the cornerstone, from my point of view, of the House bill. That was also taken out and not accepted in the conference report.

Democracy, I hope, will be the option, as we are hoping it will be in Angola with the successful repeal of the Clark amendment, and a repeal of military aid to Mozambique.

So the Africa policy in the last 6 to 8 months, from this gentleman's point of view, has been quite successful. I hope South Africa will change and will change very, very soon. This provision, in my opinion, will not fully engage change as necessary, so I intend to vote against the provision, but regardless of what happens in this House and in the Senate, and what the President finally decides ultimately to do, I hope and pray that apartheid will change and that people will be free. Let us hope and pray.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY].

Mr. DYMALLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Anti-Apartheid Act.

Mr. Speaker, symbolizing justice and humanity to much of the world, America must act, and do it quickly, to bring comfort and support to South Africa's antiapartheid movement. This Government's continuing debate over the proper course of action has only encouraged the current regime in South Africa. Indeed, our collaboration is clear. President Botha's recent declaration of the state of emergency constitutes a deliberate plan to decapitate the antiapartheid movement. While the Johannesburg police detained 1,000 blacks, the Reagan administration announced that this action fails to warrant a shift in constructive engagement with the Botha government. Caryl Chessell, the chairman of the rightwing Afrikaner secret society, Broederbond, even praised the Reagan administration last week for not interfering in South African affairs. This is the same man who has claimed that only white salvation will bring peace to South Africa. The same man who predicts that in a race war, South Africa's blacks will be no match against the minority white society. The same man who claims that the black threat

to South Africa reminds him of the Jewish threat to Germany.

Mr. Speaker, our association with South Africa is against our best interests. Let us welcome a new, just approach, embrace the antiapartheid movement, and support the Anti-Apartheid Act.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CROCKETT].

Mr. CROCKETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great sense of pride on this occasion. The chairman of my committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is from my native State of Florida, and he has expressed what I believe is the majority sentiment of this country with respect to what is happening in South Africa.

Both the ranking minority member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], and the chairman of our Subcommittee on Africa, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE], are colleagues of mine from the State of Michigan, so the State of Michigan itself is proud of the bipartisan contribution these two sons of Michigan have made.

I have no illusions, Mr. Speaker, that the passage of this conference report is going to immediately bring about changes in South Africa. I think by and large the conference report, on which I had the honor to serve as a conferee, is essentially symbolic, but I expect it to do two things:

First, to convince all doubters that the majority of the American people believe that the administration's policy of constructive engagement has been a dismal failure.

Second, to carry home to the new rulers of South Africa, to the Bishop Tutu's, to the Nelson Mandela's, and to the others who represent the future rulers of that great country, the clear message that the people of the United States are behind them in their fight for liberation.

I commend the conference report to my colleagues.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, Mr. JERRY LEWIS.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would really like, in my short time, to attempt to make a couple of points.

The first relates to the general issue itself, the conference report that is before us. Frankly, as I sat and listened earlier to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], express his concerns, I could not help but want to recognize that, indeed, in this very delicate circumstance I can understand why a public policy maker would have concerns of that kind.

Having said that, it is my view that the House owes a deep debt of gratitude to Chairman DANTE FASCELL, and to my ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], for dealing with this very, very difficult circumstance. It has got to be clear to anybody who will but take a look that the difficulties in South Africa are difficulties that we cannot ignore.

□ 1440

When we have a circumstance in which at least two-thirds of the people of a country are not given even the basic vestige of what we know as civil rights in this country, indeed we know that circumstance is going to change. For once, as America attempts to take the side of that which is morally correct, let us hope our policy allows us, as that change takes place, to land on the right side of the curve, because we have a fundamental and critical interest in South Africa.

Having said that, let me say that I attended the conference for another purpose, not as a member of the conference but, rather, to deal with the issue of whether America should participate in this process by way of issuing American gold coins. I want to express my deep appreciation to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO], for his great cooperation and making possible the progress we have made in connection with that work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has expired.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional one-half minute to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want every Member of this House to know the important role that the gentleman from California has played in the gold coin portion of this legislation.

Much of the gold coin provision which we are voting on today was taken from H.R. 1123, introduced on February 19 by Mr. LEWIS, along with the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON], and 237 other Members of the House.

It was the hard work and tireless efforts of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] that provided the push for the Gold Coin Program. And while I had differences in the technical aspects of the legislation, I never for 1 minute had a difference with the gentleman from California for the laudable purposes of the legislation.

Had the conference not addressed the gold coin issue at this time, the Consumer Affairs and Coinage Sub-

committee, which I chair, was scheduled to hold hearings on the gentleman's legislation in September. And I am certain that the committee would have reported the legislation and it would have passed the House floor.

So while the conference did not directly pass the Lewis bill, it did pass the Lewis principle. The gentleman from California deserves the plaudits of every Member of the House as well as everyone in this country who was interested in a Gold Coin Program.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO], for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks here just before final adoption by the House of Representatives of the conference report on H.R. 1640 in regard to the coins authorized in that legislation. As the distinguished chairman of the Banking Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage has acknowledged, the substance of the Senate amendment that was accepted by the conferees to this legislation is the same as H.R. 1123, which I introduced on February 19, so I think it is useful to explain for the RECORD what we are doing here by agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The chairman has suggested that the gold bullion coins will not become a circulating medium of exchange. In this detail, I believe history will prove him wrong. The fictional dollar values assigned in the conference will not cause the gold coins never to circulate. As the distinguished ranking member of the Banking Committee, Mr. WYLIE, a member of the conference committee, stated in his remarks a few minutes ago, the coins will circulate at their market value.

The fictional face value on the gold coins was necessary to assure the legal tender status of the gold coinage in international trade, and to assure that foreign nations will be required under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to permit the duty-free import of U.S. coins.

Nevertheless, I am proud that the conferees have accepted the Senate amendment—the U.S. gold bullion coins that we initiated here by introducing H.R. 1123. I want to congratulate my colleague from California, Mr. DIXON, for the help he has given us in bringing this legislation forward. We are proud that the bullion coin legislation has been cosponsored by every member of the Black Caucus as well as the entire Republican leadership. Without his very early support and endorsement of this positive solution to the problem of the Krugerrand, it would never have been possible to achieve this degree of success.

The idea of a U.S. bullion coin, which is before us today as the Senate amendment to H.R. 1460, has received

the endorsement and cosponsorship of over 238 of our colleagues. This overwhelming show of support for the idea of a U.S. gold coinage is a tribute to the bipartisan spirit in the Congress when the time for a new idea has truly come.

The idea for this gold coinage was first presented to Congress by the report of the Gold Commission in 1982. The Gold Commission was a special, joint commission with representatives from the Federal Reserve, the Council of Economic Advisors, the Joint Economic Committee, the Senate and House Banking Committees, and the public. The 17-member Commission was chaired by the Secretary of Treasury, who is presently the Chief of Staff at the White House. One of the Gold Commission's most active members was our former colleague, Ron Paul of Texas, who had made the reestablishment of a U.S. gold coinage his primary mission in his four terms in Congress.

The Gold Commission's duty was to sit in judgment on the controversy surrounding the role of gold. There were voices demanding a "return to the gold standard" and a mixture of opinions regarding the role of monetary policy and alternative regimes the United States might adopt to stabilize our system. The Gold Commission was mandated to study and recommend a policy to the Congress that would set the role of gold in our monetary system, with as little regard for politics or prejudice as might be possible. Its report to the Congress was transmitted on March 31, 1982.

The sole recommendation of the Gold Commission was Ron Paul's proposal for a U.S. gold coinage. That is the substance of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1460 before the House today. The Gold Commission, like the Congress today, supported the concept of a gold coinage with a common consensus that such a coinage will be an overall benefit to our monetary system.

To quote the report of the Gold Commission:

Among those who support the proposal, two conceptions of the character of the demand for such coins are evident. Some of us expect the demand for such coins to be an investment demand, similar to the demand for Krugerrands, Maple Leafs, Mexican pesos, and other foreign coins that have found a market in this country. Others expect the demand for such coins to be (or have the potential to be) a demand for their use as money. Their value would change from day to day as the value of the gold content of the coin fluctuated in the free gold market.

Some advocates of this proposal see such coins as facilitating development of a dual monetary system, which would impose an additional degree of discipline on discretionary operation of monetary policy.

This was the case that Congressman Paul put before the Gold Commission, and he carried the Secretary of the

Treasury and the overwhelming majority of the Gold Commission with him.

The clear intent of the Commission in its recommendation to the Congress was to create competition in these two aspects of the monetary system: First, between gold coins from different issuers, to let the American public have the opportunity to satisfy a strongly revealed demand for such coins in a way that would not require them to extend a hand to a symbol of apartheid or to a foreign sovereign; and second, between forms of money, as in a dual monetary system with the parallel, concurrent circulation of gold ounces and paper dollars—with the clear implication that without an exclusive circulation for the one form or the other, there could evolve some greater implicit discipline on the monetary authorities.

In the 99th Congress, my colleague, Mr. DIXON, and I have worked to bring the Gold Commission's recommendation to this final stage. On February 19 of this year, we introduced H.R. 1123 to create a coin similar to the Gold Commission's recommendation and be positioned in the world coin market so as to reduce substantially, if not eliminate, the circulation of foreign gold coins in this country, particularly the Krugerrand from South Africa.

On March 7, the majority leader, Mr. DOLE, and Senator CRANSTON, the minority whip in the Senate and a member of both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Senate Banking Committee, introduced an identical bill, and that measure is before this House today as the Senate coinage amendment to H.R. 1460.

Although there have been no committee hearings and no reports in this Congress on the gold coinage, the Banking Committees of the House and Senate have thoroughly examined the merits of the proposal in the previous Congresses, and of course we have the report of the Gold Commission as part of the legislative history of this monetary reform.

I believe that history will unfold an evolution in the role of these new U.S. gold coins. From a small but auspicious beginning, millions of American will become owners of gold bullion coins. When the day comes—and it will—when the paper dollar once again depreciates rapidly due to an irresponsible and inflationary monetary policy, our people will turn to their bullion coins and find in our action today the foundation for monetary stability.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO].

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida,

and I rise in strong support of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the events of the past several weeks have awakened us to the fact that the situation in South Africa can no longer be ignored and can no longer be swept under the rug through a policy of constructive engagement.

For years the administration has been promising us that if we just went along with a policy of friendly persuasion, things would begin to improve. We have continued to receive assurances from the White House that things were improving. The events of recent weeks have shown that this is simply not the case.

The state of emergency imposed by the government in Pretoria is vivid evidence that that the situation is not only not getting better but is in fact getting worse. Whatever few human rights the black population of South Africa had have been brutally revoked by this desperate move.

As the leader of the free world, this Nation can no longer sit quietly by and while a government that has enjoyed our support becomes increasingly oppressive. The time has come to remove our heads from the sand and recognize that our policy of constructive engagement has been a failure. The time has come to impose severe and meaningful sanctions against South Africa, ones that will forcefully demonstrate our disdain for their blatant violation of human rights.

I stand today in support of the measures this Congress is considering against South Africa. How many times can we afford to stand by and allow the Communists to exploit an intolerable situation to their own advantage while we do nothing? Haven't we learned from bitter experience what can result when people of good will and fine intentions close their eyes to brutality?

There is still time for us to act. The blood of innocent people has already begun to flow in South Africa, and unless the civilized world is prepared to stand up and demand that it be stopped, I am afraid that the results will be tragic.

I strongly urge my colleagues to take action now. Perhaps if the government in Pretoria is finally convinced that we are serious about our opposition to their actions they will begin to take respect for human rights seriously. As we voted for the original legislation, we must now support this conference report.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I speak with honor and pride today that I am a Member of this House which is considering the conference report on H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act, which I have cosponsored.

My regret is that the Congress did not adopt this legislation last year. Although the House adopted a similar bill, the Senate did not do so. If the Congress had taken a stand, perhaps lives in South Africa would have been saved. Perhaps we would not be witnessing the dire situation which exists in South Africa today.

In speaking in favor of the legislation when the House debated it in June, I said that we must realize the long-term implications of our present relationship with South Africa. I said that most people agree that the walls of apartheid will be torn down, and that most people agree that the longer the walls remain standing, the more violent will be the means to bring them down. We are now witnessing that violence. We must not delay another day in taking a stand for our Government against the evil of apartheid.

The legislation which we have before us today clearly demonstrates our distaste for apartheid. It takes important steps to end our country's financial support for the South African system. In the legislation: We end bank loans to South Africa, we prohibit the importation of South African gold coins, we prohibit the sale of computer equipment to South Africa and we seek to end new investment by American companies in South Africa unless there is significant change in the apartheid system.

Some say that this legislation is not enough. That we must end all American investment in South Africa. That is true. We can continue to work toward that goal, and if no progress occurs implement such a policy. But the legislation which we have before us today is an excellent start. It ends our country's misguided policy of "constructive engagement" and in its place makes clear that we have no tolerance for the immoral system of apartheid.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this legislation. I am honored to vote to bring freedom and justice to all of the people of South Africa.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DeWINE], who signed the conference report.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DeWINE. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in very strong support of this measure, which is long overdue, to bring justice and equal opportunity to South Africa. I commend the leadership of our Committee on Foreign Affairs and of the Subcommittee on Africa for bringing this measure to the floor before we recess and, hopefully, in time to save additional lives.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all of my colleagues will be able to support this legislation, an important step in the increased American pressure that should be brought against the South African Government in an effort to persuade it to end its current harsh, discriminatory policies.

The recent events in South Africa emphasize the need for this legislation. Some forces in South Africa will use the present unrest as an excuse to press for the repeal of the modest reforms that have been made up to this date. We must speak to those forces, and let them know that we expect progress, not reaction, in the face of current tensions. Obviously, the system in South Africa cannot be changed overnight. But we expect measured, real change to come about.

This bill provides immediate sanctions in the form of a cutoff of loans to the South African Government, a banning of the importation of Krugers, and a halt to shipments of computers to that country. The bill calls for increasing sanctions in the months and years ahead if South Africa fails to heed the call of the international community and the great majority of its own people and if it fails to undertake serious reforms.

I was pleased to support the original bill when it came to the House floor, and I am happy to support this compromise version of the legislation.

Mr. DeWINE. Mr. Speaker, I voted against this bill when it came on the House floor. I voted against it in committee and subcommittee. But last night I signed the conference committee report.

Make no mistake about it, this is a much superior bill than the one we sent out of this House, and it is superior for several reasons. First of all, it does have mandatory Sullivan principles in it. It allows the United States to continue and to expand its constructive role in South Africa. It has mandatory Sullivan principles for all U.S. companies doing business in South Africa.

The second main reason that I am supporting this bill is because the House bill was all front loaded. It did everything right away. This bill is a much more reasoned, logical approach. It does a few things at first, and then it tells the Government of South Africa, "This is what we are going to do, and this is how you can avoid it if you will grant some very basic, elementary human rights."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report. I urge my President to sign the bill. It is a good bill, it is a constructive bill. No one on either side of the aisle knows, frankly, what good this bill will do. We do not honestly know. Sometimes I think both sides overestimate our ability to control events in South Africa,

but it is right that we try, and this is the right bill to do it with.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, very quickly, I would like to say that from the magic moments when Randall Robinson and our colleague, the gentleman from the District of Columbia, Mr. WALTER FAUNTROY, started the demonstrations in front of the South African Embassy, to the point where so many of us demonstrated in front of that embassy, to the magic moment yesterday when in fact I was honored to be one of the conferees to sign that conference report, I have believed that peaceful and constructive and meaningful demonstrations can bring about change, and I think that was the product of yesterday's debate.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was a Member who offered one of the two substitutes considered by this Congress when this issue was before us at an earlier point in time, and I, too, am happy today to stand and urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Let me point out what we have included in this particular package. I want to commend those Members on both sides of the aisle of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Banking Committee for an outstanding job of bringing about a bipartisan program for justice in South Africa. That is what this is. It is the positive action that we talked about, with Sullivan proposals, the scholarships for the blacks, and the conditional investment as well.

I consider that positive because it says there are certain things we are going to do today. We are going to tell the Government of South Africa, "Clean up your act. Bring justice to all your people or a year from now we are going to take tougher actions. But you be the judge."

What we are really doing today, then, is we are going beyond the positive actions of conditional investment and the positive actions I have mentioned to include some sanctions, something many of us on our side of the aisle opposed earlier. Why should we do that today? I believe that the sanctions included in this bill are a legitimate response to the state of emergency and the actions that are occurring by the South African Government today, and I say that it would be wrong for the greatest free republic in the world to not have some kind of response for the rest of the world to know that we still are the bastion of freedom and we want to send that signal to the world, that bipartisan plan for justice.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are doing today. I commend my colleagues for this action, and I join with them in their very positive action on this particular proposal.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the principal sponsors of this bill, the gentleman from Michigan, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from New York. Throughout their long and distinguished careers in this body, they have worked tirelessly for a just and humane policy toward South Africa. We are deeply indebted to them for dedicating so much of their enormous talent, their unbounded energy and their great wisdom to this cause.

The sanctions in this bill will not force the South African Government to immediately grant equal rights to blacks.

But those who rule in South Africa should understand the bill's full meaning.

It means that the United States has joined the peaceful protest against apartheid—we will use nonviolent pressure to hasten the end of racial domination.

And this bill means that we do not regard the oppressors in South Africa as allies. Their rigid adherence to apartheid is the best friend the Soviet Union has in Africa.

One of the bill's sanctions—the restriction on computer sales to the South African Government—directly affects the enforcement of apartheid.

As the originator of the ban on computer sales to the South African Government which the House passed in the Anti-Apartheid Act, and as the conferee who negotiated the compromise which appears in this bill, I would like to comment on the computer sanctions.

These are significant new restrictions on computer sales to the South African Government. They close huge loopholes in current regulations.

It is important to note that the sanctions apply to all future sales of computers, software or goods or technology intended to service computers—whether or not such sales may be subject to long-term contracts or leasing arrangements. Explicit language in the House bill applied the sanctions to existing contracts. This was dropped in conference only because it was no longer necessary. The House bill amended the Export Administration Act, which contains a contract sanctity provision exempting contracted exports from foreign policy controls. The computer sanctions in this bill are free standing. They do not fall under the Export Administration Act, and therefore need no special provision to assure that they apply to all exports, whether subject to a contract or not.

The bill imposes a total ban on computer sales to South Africa's military, police and apartheid-enforcing agencies.

The ban applies to sales of all computers of any size. Current regulations, by contrast, impose no controls on personal computer sales to South Africa's police or apartheid-enforcing agencies. Exceptions for personal computers are inappropriate in the South African context. Any personal computer can be outfitted with a hard disk with a memory of 2,000 pages, or, using a modem, can become a terminal for a mainframe and have access to its memory bank. The South African Government can use personal computers in local and regional offices, as well as central government mainframe computers, to enforce controls on blacks.

The sanctions explicitly cover software and servicing for American computers already owned by the South African Government. Current regulations exempt from controls software and servicing for goods previously licensed.

The ban on sales to the military, police and apartheid-enforcing agencies covers all computer sales for any purpose. Current regulations allow computer sales to these entities if it is somehow determined that the computer will not contribute significantly to security or apartheid functions.

Finally, all computers sold to any entity of the South African Government are subject to the end use verification requirement. The verification procedures must be adequate to assure the computers are not used for police, military or apartheid-enforcing purposes. Currently, there are no such controls over computers sold to most agencies of the South African Government.

Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed by the active lobbying which some computer companies did to minimize restrictions on computer sales to the South African Government—particularly Control Data, IBM, and Hewlett-Packard.

To be fair, these companies argued from the beginning that they did not wish to sell new computers to South Africa's military, police, or apartheid-enforcing agencies. But they did want to continue to serve and provide software for computers previously sold or leased to these agencies. They insisted on continuing to sell to other agencies of the South African Government—even those which do not in any way benefit blacks.

As far as I know, computer industry spokesmen were the only business representatives who mounted an active campaign against sanctions in this bill. Their actions are surprising, given that their product contributes so directly to apartheid, and sales to the South African Government represent

such a tiny fraction of their worldwide profit.

Recall that when some American companies unknowingly contracted to sell nerve gas chemicals to Iraq, those companies appealed to the Government for sanctions to relieve them from any obligation to fulfill the nerve gas contracts. I would have thought that American computer companies would take a similar view of their business with the South African Government. A total ban on computer sales to the Government would relieve them of any obligation to sell a computer that might be used to oppress blacks.

Were it not for computer company lobbying, this bill might have contained the original House ban on all computer sales to the South African Government. It would have been much stronger. Even though this bill requires verification procedures, it is going to be very difficult to prevent the South African Government from using any computer at its disposal to maintain controls over the daily lives of blacks.

I would urge the computer companies voluntarily to halt all sales to the South African Government, following the example of American banks. Some things are more important than profits.

If the computer companies are determined to sell the South African Government, I would note that much of the burden for end use verification will fall on their shoulders. I would urge them to be thorough and conscientious to assure there is no diversion of their computers to use in enforcing apartheid.

Finally, I would note that the Statement of Managers urges computer companies not to sell computers of any size to South African Government agencies which provide no services to nonwhites. Although the law prohibits only sales above \$100,000 to such agencies, I would urge the companies to sell computers only to government entities which provide valuable services to blacks in South Africa.

□ 1450

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ZSCHAU], a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report. I want to commend the conferees and the authors of this legislation for their leadership.

When H.R. 1460 was before the House earlier this year, I voted against it. Although I supported its objective of helping to bring an end to apartheid, I felt that it contained provisions that would be counterproductive to that objective. In particular, I opposed the ban on new investment. Many U.S.

companies are playing a constructive role in bringing about fair employment practices and a better life to black South Africans. These companies, which subscribe to the Sullivan principles, should be encouraged to expand and help bring about change rather than being stifled.

I offered an amendment to the House bill that would have restricted the ban on new investment to only those companies that did not abide by the Sullivan code. My amendment was defeated. However, I'm pleased that the concept of my amendment is in this conference report. The Sullivan code is made mandatory, and there is no ban on new investment by U.S. companies.

I was also concerned about the blanket ban on computer sales to the Government of South Africa contained in the House bill. We should not be selling computers for use by the South African Government in administering apartheid. In fact, current export regulations restrict that. However, I feel that U.S. companies should be able to compete for the business of South African Government agencies that have nothing to do with the enforcement of apartheid and which provide valuable services to nonwhites as well as whites. In this conference report, the computer ban is targeted to restrict computer sales only to those agencies that enforce apartheid. That is as it should be.

This conference report, in my opinion, is a balanced and responsible action. It is important that it is balanced and responsible. However, it is essential that it is an action. The time for talk is past. The time for action is now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report, and I urge the President to sign this legislation into law.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO], a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who voted against the bill when it passed the House, but I must point out to my colleagues that this is not the same bill. In my opinion, the House-passed bill would have been counterproductive, would have done more damage than good. I think the bill as drafted by the conference committee is appropriate. It makes a statement that we should all make and I think it may well help the situation in South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote for the bill.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, to conclude the debate now on our side, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this conference report. Over the last 2 hours, I have been circulating on the floor among Republican Members who voted against this bill when it left the House. A letter to the President, which I intend to read at this point, along with the signatures of the Members who have signed the letter, is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 1, 1985.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On June 5, 1985, the House of Representatives voted by an overwhelming margin to immediately impose economic sanctions on South Africa. Subsequently, the Senate on July 11 passed its version of sanctions against the South African government by an even larger margin. We opposed the House bill believing many of its provisions to be ineffective and counterproductive.

However, we are now prepared to support the agreement reached last night by House and Senate conferees. We believe the Conference Report to be a fair and reasonable compromise between the House and Senate positions. Furthermore, the persistent and escalating violence in South Africa requires our country to respond immediately to this crisis.

We respectfully urge you not to veto this measure because it is an important statement of U.S. policy for the future. It has bipartisan support in both Houses which is almost certainly substantial enough to override a veto. Given our strong support for this measure, we would be compelled to actively work for such an override, should it become necessary. We urge you to accept the Conference Report on H.R. 1460.

Mr. Speaker, that letter is signed by myself, MESSRS. BROOMFIELD, GINGRICH, HENRY, GUNDERSON, CRAIG, HILLIS, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, MESSRS. STRANG, BEREUTER, DREIER, ZSCHAU, LAGOMARSINO, WHITTAKER, DEWINE, and COBEY.

We will have other signatures before this day is over. I expect to nearly double that number.

I think it is a signal to the President that those 127 people who voted against this bill when it left the House is not a base upon which to build a veto. In fact, that base is deteriorating.

The President ought to sign this bill. It is a good bill at a good time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for yielding.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes for purposes of closing the debate to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLARZ. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today marks an historic beginning for the U.S. Congress. While we have always been able to battle the disgusting practice of apartheid with rhetoric, we have the opportunity today to put the U.S. Congress on record

against the policies of the South African Government. I want to ask our colleagues in the other body at this time to approve the conference report to H.R. 1460. Let America again be looked upon as the primary defender of world rights and liberties.

Obviously, the legislation is a first, albeit important, step in the fight against apartheid. No one in the Congress should overlook the significance of today's legislation. Unless the South African Government changes its ways, more needs to be done in the future. However, I am concerned that while the measure we have before us today may soon become law, it still might lack the full support of the administration.

Mr. Speaker, we are not the only nation with an interest in this matter. The case for bringing economic sanctions against South Africa by the international community at the United Nations is a continuing one. The world body needs the backing of the United States to pass meaningful sanctions against the South Africans. I am very concerned that the administration might not support the limited sanctions we are considering today. Such a lack of support would break the back of those advocating an end to the apartheid system. Thus, I will be introducing legislation in September which would express the sense of the Congress that this institution expects the administration to uphold these sanctions should they become law. In such a highly visible world forum as the United Nations, the potential damage that might result to the anti-apartheid movement from administration inaction is enormous.

Mr. Speaker, should H.R. 1460 become law, it must mark the end of the policy of constructive engagement. Let us not be the one nation standing in the way of social reform in South Africa. In the face of new regulations banning even outdoor funerals, I call upon the President to support this legislation, and to meet with members of the Congressional Black Caucus to hear our concerns on this matter.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, this is an extraordinarily significant achievement. For the first time since the establishment of apartheid in 1948, 37 years ago, the United States will be going on record as making clear our opposition to apartheid by deed, as well as by word.

The adoption of this conference report will send a message to the minority regime in South Africa that the United States will not continue to conduct business as usual with them in the absence of any meaningful progress for the elimination of apartheid.

It will send a message to the indigenous majority within South Africa that the United States is on the side of

change, rather than on the side of the status quo in that country.

A little bit earlier, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] said that he was fearful of the consequences for the West if an unfriendly government should one day come to power in South Africa. Well, let me tell my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, and the other Members of this House, that sooner or later, the black majority in South Africa will inevitably be in a position to determine their own destiny and when that day comes, the United States will be in a much better position to have a truly constructive relationship with South Africa if, in the interim, we have made it clear that we are on the side of change, rather than on the side of the status quo.

Mr. Speaker, I want to use this opportunity to close the debate to make a plea to the President of the United States, who has here an opportunity to create a genuine bipartisan consensus with respect to our foreign policy toward South Africa, not only a consensus among Democrats and Republicans in the Congress, but a consensus between the Congress and the executive branch itself.

We are much more effective abroad when we are united at home. How wonderful it would be if we could all stand up in the Rose Garden of the White House, Republicans and Democrats alike, together with the President of the United States, and say to South Africa and the rest of the world that the United States, at long last, is prepared to use its influence, its resources, to help bring about the elimination of apartheid in South Africa.

I would say to the President of the United States, "Mr. President, after the murder of 500 blacks in South Africa in the last year alone, most of them by the security forces of that country, after the establishment of the state of seige, after the withdrawal of the U.S. Ambassador to South Africa from Pretoria and the withdrawal of the South African Ambassador to the United States from Washington, after the establishment of sanctions against South Africa by Canada and France and the call for sanctions against South Africa unanimously by the Security Council of the United Nations, the time has come for us to finally write the obituary for the policy of constructive engagement.

"It was tried, but it did not work, and it created the impression that the United States was somehow in sympathy with the Government of South Africa without producing any meaningful progress toward the elimination of apartheid."

□ 1500

We need a new policy, the policy embodied in this conference report which

calls for the elimination forthwith of apartheid in South Africa.

● Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with many issues today, but few are more important or timely than the adoption of this conference report. The events of the last few weeks have proven—if further proof were needed—that the Government of South Africa ruthlessly represses its black citizens. Just yesterday, new restrictions were imposed on funerals, which are the only form of political expression left to South African blacks.

Many Americans have watched in horror and frustration the deteriorating situation in South Africa. And they have asked a single question: What is our Government, one that is founded on respect for human rights and human freedom, what is our Government doing to end this tragedy? The answer to that question is in this legislation. The measures it proposes are quite simply the least we can do.

There have been many speeches made about the situation in South Africa. But this bill speaks more loudly and more effectively than even the most eloquent words. It is our opportunity to demonstrate our commitment to racial justice and political liberties, not just at home but abroad.

Mr. Speaker, there should be no controversy about this conference report. The House has agreed to these provisions. The Senate has agreed. I hope the White House will come to agree as well. But now it is time for us to act. I urge my colleagues to adopt this conference report.●

● Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act, as reported by the conference committee. While this Member would have preferred to see the Congress pass the measure previously approved by the House, the compromise represented by the conference report imposes economic sanctions on South Africa and indicates the steps we are willing to take if conditions in that country do not improve.

At present, the situation in South Africa is deteriorating. The 500 dead and over 1,200 arrests in the past year, and the current state of emergency that accelerated these statistics, speak of a situation which the United States must not continue to ignore. Our current policy of constructive engagement is an embarrassment. The South African Government has graphically illustrated the fact that it is unimpressed by this country's quiet, and unenthusiastic, disapproval of apartheid. Our credibility as a nation concerned with civil rights and willing, as we have done most recently in the case of Nicaragua, to express this conviction in concrete terms is on the line here. We must, at a minimum, vote in favor of the Anti-Apartheid Act.●

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, we have before us the conference report on H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act. It is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

This bill imposes an immediate ban on the importation of Krugerrands, prohibits loans to the South African Government, puts limitations on exports of computers to the South African Government, and imposes limitations on the export of nuclear goods and technology.

Additional sanctions are to be imposed if, after a 12-month period, the South African Government makes no progress toward ending apartheid. The sanctions can be eased if the Government makes progress. These additional sanctions include a ban on new U.S. investment in South Africa, prohibition of the imports into the United States of coal or uranium from South Africa, and the revocation of the most-favored-nation tariff status South Africa now enjoys with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, South Africa's practice of apartheid—institutional racism—is brutal and utterly inhumane. It is contrary to any standard of civilized society, and it must be stopped.

The Reagan administration's policy of constructive engagement is a failure. It has done nothing to ease the plight of South Africa's 22 million blacks. Rather, internal repression has escalated dramatically over the last 4 years. Black South Africans cannot vote or run for public office or have a voice in their own destiny. The South African Government's homelands policy has resulted in over 9 million black South Africans being stripped of their citizenship in the land of their own birth. The South Africa Government has increased its oppression of trade unions. Its policies have resulted in the deaths of blacks fighting for their rights and freedom. Constructive engagement has aligned the United States—our country—with the repression of white rule in the eyes of South Africa's black majority. America should stand for justice in South Africa. It is right and it will best serve our national interest.

Now South African President Botha has declared a state of emergency in that country. Repeatedly we see footage of black South Africans demonstrating for their rights and freedoms. Repeatedly we hear stories of more deaths of black South Africans, killed in the pursuit of these goals.

Mr. Speaker, as citizens of the United States, where freedom and equality are held precious and inviolable, we must support these overriding principles on behalf of an oppressed people. Black South Africans have made it clear that even if sanctions create hardships for them in the short run, they are willing to bear the burden to achieve political and eco-

conomic freedom in the long run. The struggle in South Africa is not about jobs or investments, it's about justice and dignity and political freedom.

South African Bishop Desmond Tutu, recipient of the 1984 Nobel Prize for Peace, has said that no amount of repression can contain the millions of black South Africans who are determined to be free. Let us join with them and help them achieve their aspirations. Support this bill.

Thank you.●

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is now quite evident that in the past few weeks the policy of constructive engagement with South Africa has had very negative consequences. Coupled with the recent crackdown by South African authorities and the resulting deaths and arrests of South African blacks, President Reagan appears to have no choice now but to sign this historic legislation.

In conference, members of the President's own party have clearly repudiated the Reagan administration's policy of constructive engagement by agreeing to the conference report on the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985. It is now up to the whole Senate to follow the leadership of Senator LUGAR, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and put the entire Senate on record in opposition to the apartheid system.

The Senate and ultimately the President, by agreeing to and signing the bill, will usher in a new era in U.S. foreign policy. We will serve notice to the world that the United States will be willing to use economic sanctions to protect the human rights of people across the world. Clearly, the American people are making the struggle for human dignity their own struggle. Surely the President and Senate cannot ignore now the will of the American people manifesting itself in an overwhelming 380-48 repudiation of constructive engagement.

If our great Nation is committed to equality and justice, then we must honor our own standards here and abroad and immediately disassociate ourselves from the appalling system of apartheid. As Bishop Desmond Tutu, Nobel Peace Prize winner, remarked, "Economic restrictions are black South Africa's only chance. The argument that blacks would suffer most from greater economic pressure is moral humbug." Today, my colleagues, we can set into motion a forceful and realistic attack on South African apartheid. A policy that will enfranchise black South Africans with dignity and respect, and the political privileges that citizens all over the free world too often take for granted.●

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, South Africa's policy of apartheid represents vicious, institutionalized racism. It is a practice that has not ended with the administration's policy of constructive

engagement. The fact is constructive engagement is a failed policy, and the time has come to stop providing support to a nation whose practices so completely belie our own democratic traditions of fairness and equality under the law. It is time to repudiate the policy of constructive engagement.

The failure of constructive engagement is evidenced by this morning's headlines. In response to increasingly vocal opposition to apartheid the white minority government of South Africa has banned outdoor funerals with any political content. Rather than working with black leaders to ease tensions, the Government has removed the only manner in which blacks were able to demonstrate their opposition to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation which will impose economic sanctions against South Africa. Economic sanctions can be a legitimate tool of foreign policy, and I am convinced that this would be an appropriate and effective means to bring about change in South Africa. It would, in any case, leave no question where the United States stands on the abhorrent policy of apartheid.

The economic sanctions in the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985 are just and represent a critical first step in disassociating the United States from the cruel and racist policies of South Africa. I urge adoption of this legislation.●

● Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to once again express my deep concern that our Government recognize the brutality endemic to the apartheid regime in South Africa, and that we as a nation abandon, without further delay, our policy of constructive engagement.

Mr. Speaker, France, Canada, and other members of the world community of nations are taking firm and unequivocal stands in response to Pretoria's unprecedented crackdown against the black people of South Africa. We can no longer continue to cling to a policy which has failed so completely and so tragically. South Africa must be made to understand that if it does wish to be considered a member of the western community of nations, there are certain standards which must be met. Simply claiming to be anti-Communist is not enough. If South Africa insists on its right to reject and defy all tenets of social and political justice and decency, we must insist upon our right to disassociate completely from that tyranny.

The international community is already doing precisely what I am advocating here today. France, Sweden, Canada have all taken a stand. European parliamentarians are protesting en masse.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that the United States of America not be the one country clinging tenaciously to

the apartheid regime while all other nations, great and small, do their parts to hasten the dismantlement of the repulsive system.

On March 7, 1985, I introduced the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985. On July 31, House and Senate conferees agreed to ban bank loans to the South African public sector, ban nuclear trade with South Africa, ban computer exports to the Government of South Africa, and end the importation of South African Krugerrands into this country.

Constructive engagement clearly reflects neither the will of the American people nor the rising international tide in opposition to apartheid. I commend House and Senate conferees on the leadership they have shown. I trust that this bipartisan, bicameral position makes clear the urgency of implementing a new and enlightened South African policy.●

● Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida, for his outstanding and effective effort in bringing legislation important to the national interest to the floor in a timely manner. It is my understanding that over the past 2 weeks, the foreign Affairs Committee had three bills in conference simultaneously. To complicate the situation even further, it was necessary to interrupt the foreign aid conference, to take up and pass the Micronesian compact legislation. This was all accomplished smoothly.

We all owe our thanks to Mr. FASCELL, his committee, especially the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for demonstrating a true spirit of constructive bipartisanship.●

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, when the South African sanctions passed the House I voted "no." In general, I thought the motivation good, the moral statement even better, but that the results would be harmful to all parties involved, particularly the black people of South Africa.

In general, I don't like sanctions. On the record, they have not been successful. I don't like sending messages by shooting ourselves or other relatively innocent bystanders in the foot.

In general, I like the policy of constructive engagement. I believe we are more effective working with foreign governments than we are when we threaten them. I like having U.S. firms, using Sullivan principles, standing as an example and a symbol in South Africa.

But, conditions have taken us past the in general stage and the personal preference state. The situation in South Africa has worsened, and continues to do so.

The conference report has taken us past the send-a-message stage. It is a vast improvement over the previously passed House bill. Both the carrots and the 1-year stick are helpful.

It is now time for the Congress to act.

For those of us who don't like sanctions, who want to keep the U.S. presence as a symbol in South Africa, it is time to acknowledge the need for action.

There is a cost to us, and to the people, black and white, of South Africa. There are times when people of good will must accept some costs in the name of principle. One speaker today said that moral question had become predominant.

I am forced to conclude he is right. I must vote for this bill. ●

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was honored to participate in the conference on the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985. I urge support of this most essential piece of legislation.

The sanctions that conferees agreed on against South Africa include banning the importation of Krugerrands, halting new U.S. bank loans, banning the sale of nuclear technology, applying the Sullivan principles to U.S. firms with more than 25 employees, minting new U.S. gold coins to compete with the Krugerrand, and providing \$34 million of AID funds for scholarships for black South Africans. I believe that these sanctions send a message to the South African Government that apartheid must end, that they cannot continue to oppress 23 million of its citizens. The sanctions also send a message to our Government that we don't want to be constructively engaged with a government that practices legally mandated racism.

The situation in South Africa has deteriorated drastically in the past week. Since the Government established a state of emergency 11 days ago, 25 persons have been killed and 1,259 have been arrested. In addition, a ban on outside funerals for anyone who has died of unnatural causes in any of the black townships was established today. The state of emergency grants broad powers to the South African defense force and to the South African police (including the railways police and the prisons service). Those forces are authorized to "apply * * * such force as he under the circumstances may deem necessary * * *" to prevent even a suspected danger to public order. They are authorized to arrest and detain without a warrant or charge for up to 14 days. However, that 14-day period can be extended for an indefinite period pursuant to a written notice issued by the Minister of Law and Order. Detentions under the state of emergency do not have to allow access to legal counsel or family. The names of those detained may be

withheld and any unauthorized distribution of the names is punishable by up to 10 years imprisonment or a substantial fine. It is important to note that new powers are an extension of far-reaching powers authorized under preexisting statutory law. The Internal Security Act of 1982 had already given the police broad powers to curtail the civil liberties of South Africa's black citizens. The 1982 act gives a police officer of the rank of lieutenant colonel or higher the power to detain a person incommunicado for the purposes of interrogation.

The conferees agreed that President Reagan must recommend stiffer sanctions for congressional approval, if the South African Government does not take one of several steps to end its oppressive and racist system of apartheid. These sanctions include a ban on new private U.S. investment in South Africa, a denial of most-favored-nation tariff status, and a prohibition on coal, uranium, or both. The steps that would be considered progress under the conference include an end to forced relocations, negotiations for a new political system with full rights for nonwhites, a settlement of the status of South African-controlled Namibia, freedom for all political prisoners, access to jobs and joint family housing for nonwhites, and an end to denationalization practices of segregation.

I urge support for the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985. The United States must take a stand against apartheid. ●

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my support to the conference report on H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985. While I would wish for stronger measures, such as the imposition of an immediate ban on new investments in South Africa, I can support this bill because it is the first definitive action that this Congress has taken to express its abhorrence of apartheid.

Congress hereby states that the past pressures on the South African minority rule government have failed to effect substantive changes in that country's racist policies. In fact, many in this country and in this Congress believe that the administration's policy of "constructive engagement" has been equivalent to tacit approval of apartheid and to support for Mr. Botha's white-supremacist rule.

The increasing violence and unmitigated police brutality in South Africa show us that the situation is becoming worse. The state of emergency imposed by Pretoria demonstrates that the government plans to deal with the rising level of anger in the black community by implementing more repressive policies and by arresting opposition figures. Yesterday's new ban on mass outdoor funerals, the only means for blacks in South Africa to express

dissent, makes this legislation most timely.

Mr. Speaker, this bill deserves our strong support. It is a long overdue change in our policy toward South Africa. The Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985 signifies unequivocally the beginning of the end of the fruitless policy of "constructive engagement." ●

● Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, over the past few months we have seen America's attention focused on two crises in Africa. In sub-Saharan Africa we have witnessed the starvation of hundreds of thousands of people who have had their lives devastated by the worst that nature has to offer; and America has responded.

Even as we are helping to feed starving people in Africa we have been witnessing another disaster. This disaster represents the worst that man has to offer. The present Government of South Africa survives on the basis of a repugnant system of racial servitude. Again America is responding. The frustration and anger of the American people is represented in this legislation. These economic sanctions passed by the House and Senate are the first step in using America's influence to end the system of apartheid. We realize that total change will not occur overnight. But this measure will send a clear message to South Africa and also put them on notice that the United States intends to exert whatever pressure it is capable of.

This antiapartheid legislation is a first step; it is by no means the final action. No matter what it takes—complete economic isolation, severance of diplomatic relations, and the cessation of all political contacts between our country and South Africa—apartheid must end.

This legislation is also warning to the Reagan administration. While black South Africans are being murdered and imprisoned on a daily basis, President Reagan continues to stand by his bankrupt policy of constructive engagement. The Reagan administration knows that it cannot maintain this policy.

Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistake about what we are doing here today. We are taking a largely symbolic but important action step. But this is not the end of our pressures against the racist apartheid regime in South Africa; this is the beginning of the end of apartheid. ●

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the House overwhelming approved the conference report on the Anti-Apartheid Act. It eventually will be approved by the Senate as well. While the act, as agreed to by the House and Senate conferees, is not as strong as some of us would have liked, it represents the best legislative proposal that could be obtained at this time.

Economic sanctions, at times, are more symbolic than effective. The Anti-Apartheid Act, a highly bipartisan measure, is important in that it signals to the world community and Pretoria that the Congress and the American people are committed to severing its relationship with, and support of, the most racist government on the planet. We want South Africa to open its doors of freedom to all of its citizens.

More importantly, the overwhelming support for the Anti-Apartheid Act signals to the Reagan administration that the constructive engagement policy has not only been a failure, but it has resulted in South Africa believing that the United States, while giving lip service to apartheid, encourages for South Africa to conduct business as usual. Why should South Africa change its racist policies when it feels it has the backing of the most powerful government in the world?

Constructive engagement has permitted the United States to become the largest trading partner and second-largest foreign investor in South Africa. It also has become a toothless euphemism disguising military, economic, and diplomatic support to Pretoria which, until recently, has gone almost totally unnoticed.

Late last year, the Free South Africa Movement began; members of the Congressional Black Caucus and other Members of Congress were arrested almost daily at the South Africa Embassy. These arrests were instrumental in bringing the apartheid issue, which has existed for well over a century, to the front burner. Since that time, hundreds of thousands of Americans have, in a variety of ways, joined in showing their disapproval of South Africa's policies, and the administration's policy of passivity.

In fact, at this very moment, a large protest march is occurring in Detroit in which its citizens, as they have in the past, are again demanding an end to the terror in South Africa and responsible action from our Government in Washington.

Constructive engagement has resulted in the loss of over 500 lives in South Africa during the past year; additionally, thousands of innocent people being arrested. It has provided the minority government in South Africa with the boldness to thumb its nose at the world community, and impose incredible restrictions on 24 million individuals because they happen to be black.

Considering the events of the past several months in South Africa, where blacks have been brutally murdered by the South African police while attending funerals of others who also have been killed by the police, the administration should have taken the initiative to declare its constructive engagement policy toward South Africa inef-

fective and inefficient, and a total failure. Perhaps the actions that the Congress has taken today will cause the administration to reexamine its attitude to South Africa.

This is the same administration which so eagerly provided military and CIA support to rebels committed to destroying the current government which came to power as the result of overthrowing the infamous Somoza dictatorship. In fact, many of the rebels are former members of the Somoza regime. Recently, the administration has declared the Nicaraguan government a threat to our national security, and had no problems imposing economic sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, freedom is a very precious thing, and people will do anything to get it. Time is growing short for South Africa to peacefully end its apartheid system. In fact, one might say the revolution has already begun. Our American Revolution was started over the issue of freedom, and once it started there was no way of stopping it.

The burning desire for freedom stops for no one. Nor can it be stopped. Black South Africans will be free one day; it's just a matter of time. As Bishop Desmond Tutu, South Africa's 1984 Nobel Peace Prize winner, has reminded us, no amount of repression can contain 24 million people determined to be free.

There are some who say that economic sanctions will hurt South African blacks more than it will the white minority. Yet, American firms employ less than 1 percent—66,000—of South Africa's black population. Yet, American corporations control 70 percent of the computer market, 45 percent of the oil market, and 33 percent of the automotive market. These businesses are the jugular vein of the highly sophisticated South African police state, without which Pretoria could not maintain its political and economic structure.

The House, by overwhelmingly approving the Anti-Apartheid conference report, has taken the position that it will stand on the side of freedom. I urge President Reagan to not only sign this important legislation when it reaches his desk, but to also actively support it as well, and ensure that this legislation will be enforced to the fullest extent. This is an issue which the administration can ill afford to be out of synch with the wishes of the Congress and the majority of the American people. ●

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us today, which imposes sanctions against the apartheid Government of South Africa, embodies a moderate compromise forged from this bill from the House and Senate. Neither the Senate nor the House version, by itself, would have accomplished all that I would like to

see done regarding South Africa. Neither bill would have forced the South African Government to abandon its racist policies and grant economic and political rights to the nonwhite majority in that country.—nor does this conference report.

The report nevertheless accomplishes something very important. It backs with action the emerging consensus that we should not contribute economically or politically, to the preservation of the abhorrent apartheid system. It demonstrates the commitment of the American people to serious reform in South Africa, and it does so without equivocation. It thereby enables us to join nations around the world that have taken concrete steps in support of the oppressed majority in that troubled country. France, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Australia, and others have adopted laws or taken other actions specifically directed against apartheid. In great Britain, for example, more than 120 local authorities, in cities and towns which include over two-thirds of the country's population, have joined a nationwide campaign of disinvestment.

There can be no doubt that actions of this kind have a strong impact in South Africa. The Pretoria government hears the voices from around the globe that indicate a growing isolation of their country. Black people in South Africa hear also, and are strengthened to press on with their struggle for political equality.

The South African Government has displayed a defiant mood in recent weeks. Outbreaks of political unrest and renewed resistance to white rule in black communities were met with the imposition of a "state of emergency" for the first time in 25 years. Under the emergency, the authorities' far-reaching power to detain people without charge, to carry out searches and seizures, and to control the press were expanded still further. President Botha's response to the resulting international outcry was to declare, "No self-respecting country can allow any other country, large or small, to dictate to it how it should be governed."

In spite of its tough words, Pretoria has good reason to be alarmed. This bill imposes economic sanctions for the first time in the history of United States-South African relations, to be followed by tougher U.S. sanctions a year from now if conditions do not improve. By themselves, the exact a tangible cost to the South African economy. Perhaps more important they are the beginning of a process that could lead to comprehensive multilateral sanctions and the economic and political isolation of South Africa's white supremacist government from the rest of the world.

Its defiant rhetoric to the contrary, the South African Government has always demonstrated a craving for acceptance by the other nations of the world. It has invested in public relations campaigns for foreign consumption; it has sought to capitalize on signs that the United States, or other countries, may be ready to acquiesce in the survival of institutionalized white supremacy in south Africa.

In the context, the Reagan administration's refusal to consider a change in policy toward South Africa is a moral outrage and an embarrassment to the Congress and to the American people. Its reluctance even to criticize the violent actions of the South African Government serves only to support apartheid and to encourage Pretoria in its repressive and brutal policies.

We in the House today will demonstrate our disgust both for apartheid and for "constructive engagement" by voting overwhelmingly to adopt this conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 380, nays 48, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

YEAS—380

| | | |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Ackerman | Boland | Coelho |
| Addabbo | Boner (TN) | Coleman (MO) |
| Akaka | Bonior (MI) | Coleman (TX) |
| Alexander | Bonker | Collins |
| Anderson | Borski | Conte |
| Andrews | Bosco | Conyers |
| Annuzio | Boucher | Cooper |
| Anthony | Boxer | Coughlin |
| Applegate | Breaux | Courter |
| Aspin | Brooks | Coyne |
| Atkins | Broomfield | Craig |
| AuCoin | Brown (CA) | Crockett |
| Barnard | Brown (CO) | Daniel |
| Barnes | Broyhill | Darden |
| Bartlett | Bruce | Daschle |
| Bateman | Bryant | Daub |
| Bates | Burton (CA) | Davis |
| Bedell | Bustamante | de la Garza |
| Bellenson | Byron | Dellums |
| Bennett | Campbell | Derrick |
| Bentley | Carney | DeWine |
| Bereuter | Carper | Dickinson |
| Berman | Chandler | Dicks |
| Bevill | Chappell | Dingell |
| Biaggi | Clay | DioGuardi |
| Billakis | Clinger | Dixon |
| Bliley | Coats | Donnelly |
| Boehlert | Cobey | Dorgan (ND) |
| Boggs | Coble | Dowdy |

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Downey | Lagomarsino | Rodino |
| Dreier | Lantos | Roe |
| Duncan | Latta | Roemer |
| Durbin | Leach (IA) | Rogers |
| Dwyer | Lehman (CA) | Rose |
| Dymally | Lehman (FL) | Rostenkowski |
| Dyson | Leland | Roukema |
| Early | Lent | Rowland (CT) |
| Eckart (OH) | Levin (MI) | Rowland (GA) |
| Edgar | Levine (CA) | Roybal |
| Edwards (CA) | Lewis (CA) | Russo |
| Edwards (OK) | Lewis (FL) | Sabo |
| English | Lightfoot | Savage |
| Erdreich | Lipinski | Saxton |
| Evans (IA) | Livingston | Scheuer |
| Evans (IL) | Lloyd | Schneider |
| Fascell | Long | Schroeder |
| Fawell | Lott | Schulze |
| Fazio | Lowery (CA) | Schumer |
| Feighan | Lowry (WA) | Seiberling |
| Fiedler | Lujan | Sensenbrenner |
| Fish | Lukens | Sharp |
| Flippo | Lundine | Shaw |
| Florio | Lungren | Shelby |
| Foglietta | MacKay | Sikorski |
| Foley | Madigan | Siskis |
| Ford (MI) | Manton | Skeen |
| Ford (TN) | Markay | Skelton |
| Fowler | Martin (IL) | Slattery |
| Frank | Martin (NY) | Smith (FL) |
| Franklin | Martinez | Smith (IA) |
| Frenzel | Matsui | Smith (NE) |
| Frost | Mavroules | Smith (NJ) |
| Fuqua | Mazzoli | Smith, Robert |
| Gallo | McCain | Snowe |
| Garcia | McCloskey | Solarz |
| Gaydos | McCurdy | Spence |
| Gejdenson | McDade | Spratt |
| Gekas | McEwen | St Germain |
| Gephardt | McGrath | Staggers |
| Gibbons | McHugh | Stallings |
| Gilman | McKernan | Stangeland |
| Gingrich | McKinney | Stark |
| Glickman | McMillan | Stokes |
| Gonzalez | Meyers | Strang |
| Goodling | Mica | Stratton |
| Gordon | Michel | Studds |
| Gradison | Mikulski | Sundquist |
| Gray (IL) | Miller (CA) | Sweeney |
| Gray (PA) | Miller (WA) | Swift |
| Green | Mineta | Swindall |
| Gregg | Mitchell | Synar |
| Grotberg | Moakley | Tallon |
| Guarini | Molinar | Tauke |
| Gunderson | Mollohan | Tauzin |
| Hall (OH) | Montgomery | Thomas (CA) |
| Hamilton | Moody | Thomas (GA) |
| Hammerschmidt | Moore | Torres |
| Hatcher | Morrison (CT) | Torricelli |
| Hawkins | Morrison (WA) | Towns |
| Hayes | Mrazek | Trafficant |
| Heftel | Murphy | Traxler |
| Hendon | Murtha | Udall |
| Henry | Natcher | Valentine |
| Hertel | Neal | Vander Jagt |
| Hiller | Nelson | Vento |
| Hillis | Nichols | Visclosky |
| Holt | Nowak | Volkmer |
| Hopkins | O'Brien | Vucanovich |
| Horton | Oakar | Walgren |
| Howard | Oberstar | Walker |
| Hoyer | Obey | Watkins |
| Hubbard | Olin | Waxman |
| Huckaby | Ortiz | Weaver |
| Hughes | Owens | Weber |
| Hunter | Oxley | Weiss |
| Hutto | Panetta | Wheat |
| Ireland | Parris | Whitehurst |
| Jacobs | Pashayan | Whitley |
| Jeffords | Pease | Whittaker |
| Jenkins | Penny | Whitten |
| Johnson | Pepper | Williams |
| Jones (NC) | Perkins | Wilson |
| Jones (OK) | Petri | Wirth |
| Jones (TN) | Pickle | Wise |
| Kanjorski | Porter | Wolf |
| Kaptur | Price | Wolpe |
| Kasich | Pursell | Wortley |
| Kastenmeier | Rahall | Wright |
| Kemp | Rangel | Wyden |
| Kennelly | Ray | Wylie |
| Kildee | Regula | Yates |
| Kleczka | Reid | Yatron |
| Kolbe | Richardson | Young (AK) |
| Kolter | Ridge | Young (FL) |
| Kostmayer | Rinaldo | Young (MO) |
| Kramer | Roberts | Zschau |
| LaFalce | Robinson | |

NAYS—48

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Archer | Hall, Ralph | Quillen |
| Armey | Hansen | Ritter |
| Badham | Hartnett | Roth |
| Barton | Hyde | Rudd |
| Boulter | Kindness | Schaefer |
| Burton (IN) | Leath (TX) | Schuetz |
| Callahan | Mack | Shumway |
| Chappie | Marlenee | Shuster |
| Cheney | McCandless | Siljander |
| Combust | McCollum | Slaughter |
| Dannemeyer | Miller (OH) | Smith (NH) |
| DeLay | Monson | Smith, Denny |
| Dornan (CA) | Moorhead | Snyder |
| Eckert (NY) | Myers | Stenholm |
| Emerson | Nielson | Stump |
| Fields | Packard | Taylor |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|-------|----------|---------|
| Carr | Hefner | Solomon |
| Crane | Loeffler | |

□ 1520

Mr. McCANDLESS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SWINDALL and Mr. LUGAN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 144, adopted earlier today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

On July 31, 1985:

H.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution designating August 1985 as "Polish American Heritage Month."

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1985

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2577) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and for other purposes; with a Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 112 thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 112, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112 with an amendment as follows: After "legislation" at the end of the last sentence, insert: "except that this sentence shall not apply after May 15, 1986".

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the further amendment of the Senate to the Senate amendment No. 112 to H.R. 2477.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

May I say to my colleagues that the amendment adopted yesterday, after further study, appears to create more problems than it solved. We all agree we would prefer to have legislation authorizing projects; we all recognize that we would like to have our legislative committees doing authorizations.

May I say that we agree it would be much better if we could have authorizations and not have to proceed as we did. We are in accord with the feelings of the leadership of the legislative Committee on Public Works. As I said, the amendment adopted yesterday, upon further study, creates more problems than it solves.

The Senate, in looking it over, decided to give time for authorizations until May 15, 1986.

So what they have done is amend the provision that passed the House by adding the following words: "except that this sentence shall not apply after May 15, 1986."

So on yesterday we had a prohibition against initiating public works projects that were listed in that bill until we had legislative authorizations.

May I repeat that the amendment of yesterday prohibited the initiation of construction of the projects that were listed in the bill until authorized by legislation.

It also prohibited the initiation of construction of those that had already been authorized.

In order to straighten the matter out, to give the legislative committee ample time in which to pass legislation which I hope they can do, the Senate added the following words: "except that this sentence shall not apply after May 15, 1986."

We discussed this with the leadership of the legislative committee; we are in accord; and this will give ample time, hopefully, for the Congress to pass legislation.

Again, the Senate amendment will release funds for those projects that are already authorized along with those that have not been, those that have been pending for a long time upon enactment of authorizing legislation on May 15, 1986.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD], the chairman of the committee of legislative authorization.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me some time.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand this as it came back from the other body, it states that the action that was taken by the House on yesterday will be in effect until May 15, 1986, unless the Congress passes other water resource legislation before that time.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman. I would just like the Members to know that this does seem in one way like a reasonable situation. It is saying, we are going to give you close to a year to get your act together to be able to pass water resource legislation; go to conference with the other body; and have it signed into law.

However, on the other hand, it could also be a signal to the Members of the other body to say, "If you can just hang in there, and do not cooperate, and do not work, and see that no legislation is passed by May 15, then we will have our power grab back again, and that will be the law."

I would like to state for the information of the Members of the House that I have spoken with the chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works in the other body; we do know that their water resource bill is out of their committee and is now pending, sequentially, before the Finance Committee in the other body, and the Senator from Vermont, chairman of that committee, has just recently assured me that he will make every effort to see to it that they have their bill out and we can go to conference and have a law, not by May 15, but by the end of this year.

□ 1530

We certainly will have our bill on the floor here by early October. So if we can get that promised cooperation from the other body, then I believe that all of our work would have been for a good purpose and we would have straightened out this whole matter.

I wish to thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding me the time to make this statement.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, may I say that we appreciate the fine work the gentleman does, and we join with him in hoping that we can get cooperation on the other side of the Capitol to follow the authorization process. We will be cooperative in every way that we can.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman. We will keep our eye on them.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE. I want to thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for yielding to me.

Let me suggest in following up Chairman HOWARD's discussion that we have been working assiduously with Chairman WHITTEN, and Chairman HOWARD, and others, and Members of the other body, to get this matter resolved.

I think it is important for the Members to understand where this is going because you will all have a stake in this decision that is being made.

Let me suggest a couple points. One, yesterday there was an issue that had arisen with a number of the Members that had to do with authorized projects. I think that matter has to be clarified.

In the amendment that we offered and was adopted yesterday, it did put an umbrella over those 21 authorized projects.

Now, I have had a discussion with Chairman BEVILL and Chairman WHITTEN, and it was not the intent of the Public Works Committee to hold back authorized projects. Now what we are planning on doing—and I would recommend to our Appropriations Committee—is in other vehicles that are coming along, to remove that particular situation that has created a slight impediment on those projects that have already been authorized.

I would appreciate a colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama so that we are in concurrence with that understanding.

Mr. BEVILL. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is absolutely correct. This was obviously his intention, but this does clear this up. If I may, at this point, I would like to thank the gentleman for his cooperation and effort on this, because we have all spent a lot of time on this, Chairman HOWARD, and Mr. EDGAR, and many

others who have participated in it. So if I may at this point, I would like to make this point here also that the gentleman is interested in about the preliminary work. And here is a statement that will cover that:

Initiation of construction as proposed in amendment 112, which is all of the Corps of Engineers projects in this supplemental, is not intended to preclude work or actions essential to construction. It is fully intended that all the planning, design engineering, land acquisition, and bridge relocations necessary to prepare for construction of any project should proceed to the point where actual project construction may proceed when authorized and funding is available.

So I just wanted to clear that up. The gentleman is interested in that also.

Mr. ROE. That is our understanding of what the legislation will do.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I am sorry, I was distracted when you explained your proposal. Where is that language going to be placed?

Mr. BEVILL. This is going to be placed in the supplemental at the appropriate point, simply to clear that up—

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. In the bill?

Mr. BEVILL. In the supplemental, so that they can go right on with the preliminary work as intended when our bill left our committee, because they did not intend to restrict that part. But no construction. But preliminary work, studies, and that sort of thing.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. If the gentleman will continue to yield, this will have to go back to the other body then, because they have not cleared this.

Mr. ROE. No.

Mr. BEVILL. No; I see what your question is. It is in the report.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Oh, in the report?

Mr. BEVILL. Yes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. He has been very gracious in explaining the situation to several of us who have authorized projects in the conference agreement. For those projects which have done the preliminary work and are ready for construction in 1986, could the gentleman give me some assurance that those projects are going to be left on track as this legislation moves forward?

Mr. ROE. I would like to respond to the gentleman. The answer is yes on that. This morning we reviewed every

one of the 21 authorized projects that are in this bill with the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. KEMP. Including Ellicott Creek?

Mr. ROE. Yes, including Ellicott Creek and including every one that everyone called to our attention. The report we have in writing back from the corps is that it will not have an effect because all of those projects will be scheduled for consideration and construction in 1986.

Mr. KEMP. That is correct.

Mr. ROE. So therefore, as far as we are concerned, we do not see where you will have a problem with those issues, provided one of 2 things: the timeframe that is covering over in the Senate languages goes to May of next year, early May 1986, some action has to take place on the authorizing legislation between both bodies. That is one controlling date.

Mr. KEMP. Will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. ROE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEMP. What about those projects that are authorized?

Mr. ROE. I am talking about authorized projects. And I would recommend, I say to the gentleman from New York, those projects that are authorized, if we can get additional language in another piece of legislation, such as, for example, the 1986 appropriations bill, that could help move it faster. But we see no impediment to what you are trying to achieve.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a clarification?

Mr. ROE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I do not think we should mislead the gentleman. I know the gentleman does not intend to.

Mr. ROE. I do not think I mislead him.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. His project that he is vitally concerned about, Ellicott Creek in New York, cannot start with construction—they can do anything, which has mostly already been done there—construction may not start until May 15, 1986, or until subsequent legislation is passed, such as H.R. 6, providing for cost sharing. One of the things would have to be done before construction could start.

Mr. ROE. I do not want to complicate it. I have checked out in depth with the Corps of Engineers on all 21 of those projects. If the Appropriations Committee were to deprive all the money in the world to finish it, it would not make any difference because the plans and specifications will not be ready to go to bid until early 1986.

What the gentleman is saying, and correctly so, the controlling date under the Senate language is May 1986, so it is not going to impede any

of the timeframe on the Ellicott Creek project.

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

While I would have preferred the immediate availability of construction funds for those projects such as the Ellicott Creek flood control project which are authorized and which have cost-sharing agreement, my ultimate objective is to obtain the funding and complete the project as quickly as possible.

The Ellicott Creek project was originally authorized in 1970, was reauthorized in 1981, and has been covered by a cost-sharing agreement since 1982. The only obstacle preventing completion of the project has been the inability of Congress to reach a consensus on water policy so that new start construction can be funded.

My constituents already have waited too long to see this project built. This past winter, Ellicott Creek flooded, devastating the area. The most frustrating aspect is that if the flood control project had been in place, the creek would have been contained.

My colleagues from western New York and I have worked tirelessly to obtain this construction funding. I am extremely pleased that with passage of this legislation our efforts finally will be rewarded. The real beneficiaries of our action will be the residents living near the creek who no longer will need to worry about the devastation and pain that previous flooding has caused. With completion of this project, that kind of flooding will be a thing of the past.

Mr. ROE. Let me conclude on this. I usually have a tendency to be very loquacious and I have a tendency to be very fierce in my approach. I am a lot calmer today. I find it more difficult to speak when I am calmer. I think that we are making great progress. But let me say to the other Members here, those who are not directly involved at the moment, as the situation unfolds, we have a job to do. As Chairman HOWARD pointed out, by the end of September or early October we will be in a position of coming back to the House, after going to the Rules Committee, of course, coming back to the House with H.R. 6. We would hope in H.R. 6 that we will receive the strong support from the Appropriations Committee and all the Members of the House. So we are on schedule, as rapidly as possible, in our authorizing legislation.

I talked to Senator HATFIELD, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the Senate, and he has assured me that he will extend all of his effort and help on the Senate side, as Chairman HOWARD has talked to other Members, to get the program going so

we can get an authorizing piece of legislation through.

So it is going to behoove us, if I may, before I give up the rest of my time, it is going to behoove us, once we move after today, once we get that bill onto this floor, to put all of our efforts in with the Senate, to ask and implore of the Senate to move as rapidly as possible on an authorizing bill so that we can go ahead and get these matters straightened out.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Is it your belief that the May 15 date will in fact help you pressure the process to completion of H.R. 6? Is that your position?

Mr. ROE. Well, I think that the May 15 date is reasonable. In candor, somebody said to me, before we got to this agreement, what do you think the Senate will do? And I said, "If I knew that, I would be king."

So I have no idea. I think what happens with Members of the House, and, if I may say, next year we will all be seeking the support of our constituencies, it would behoove the Members of the House who are affected to ask their fellow Senators to be cooperative in the efforts we are trying to put forth.

Mr. ROEMER. I thank my colleague.

□ 1540

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference agreement, as further amended by the other body.

The Senate addition would provide that the so-called escrow language, which made the initiation of construction of new starts contingent upon the enactment of cost sharing legislation, shall not apply after May 15, 1986. This provides a 9-month period in which to enact such legislation—in my view, clearly an adequate time. I believe that as amended by the Senate, this language is consistent with the House position adopted on the floor last evening, and is worthy of all of my colleagues' support.

Mr. Speaker, there was a great deal of uncertainty on the floor last evening with regard to the operative effect of the language under consideration regarding the water projects. Because of that, I think it is important to clarify for the sake of the legislative record exactly what we have done, and propose to do, in this conference agreement is adopted. In order to do that, I would appreciate the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee, as well as the gentleman from Indiana, the ranking minor-

ity member of the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee.

As I understand it, upon the enactment of this supplemental, the initiation of construction of all of the 41 projects listed in amendment No. 112, whether currently authorized or not, would be suspended until after May 15, 1986, unless cost sharing legislation is enacted before that time.

If cost sharing legislation is enacted before May 15, 1986, construction on authorized projects could move forward in accordance with the conditions contained in such legislation.

In other words, if cost sharing legislation is enacted by May 15, 1986, any of these projects that are authorized, or that subsequently become authorized, can proceed upon enactment of the cost sharing legislation.

If cost sharing legislation is not enacted by May 15, the language originally contained in the conference agreement becomes operative. In other words, projects for which cost sharing agreements have been entered into with the Corps of Engineers can proceed, provided that such agreements have been entered into by June 30, 1986. That includes projects that are authorized, as well as projects in this bill that are currently unauthorized. Construction on those projects can be initiated after May 15, 1986, provided that a cost sharing agreement is signed by June 30.

Is that the understanding of my colleagues on the committee?

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] for his response.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that the language in the Howard amendment controls. The gentleman's interpretation seems to be OK.

May I repeat again that all of the projects listed there are under this same restriction, but when the restriction should die after May 15, 1986, or when the Congress passes an authorization, either one would change it. Otherwise, after May 15, they proceed.

I would like to call attention to the fact that the amendment of the House adopted yesterday says that the "initiation of construction" shall be subject to enactment of legislation. So in the meantime, they must proceed with all of the preliminary work including planning, design, engineering, land acquisition, bridge relocation the removal of obstructions, and other things that might be necessary to expedite or carry out the project properly.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the chairman and I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

Mr. BEVILL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct right down the line, and after May 15, 1986, if no further action is taken and no authorization bill is put through under the Howard-Roe

Amendment, as agreed, these projects, all 41, are authorized and may proceed to construction.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman and I yield to the ranking minority Member of the Public Works Committee, Mr. MYERS of Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts has very accurately portrayed and described the exact conditions for these 41 projects which was completely, completely confused yesterday. I thank the gentleman.

One thing, I think though, that we ought to add here. As a practical matter, it seems to me that there are some projects, a number of them in the country where we have been advised by the Army Corps of Engineers that they were negotiating for local involvement. They might hold up on those negotiations until after May 15. So you have only a very narrow window from May 15 to June 30, which might reduce the number that might be able to be negotiated.

I doubt if those are going to be very seriously negotiated because they do not know what will be in H.R. 6 for sure until it becomes law. Hopefully, we can get H.R. 6 passed sooner than that so we will close that window and they can start negotiating seriously. But I do think we ought to be aware of that.

Mr. CONTE. All the more reason why they should be moving on a fast track.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield, that is right. Yesterday, with what we put in the amendment, it put the emphasis and importance and the necessity upon this body to pass H.R. 6 or something similar because none of them were really going to move until we had something of substance. So this puts it really back and narrows down the time.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARNEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I was over at my office watching the colloquy and I have a unique situation of having a project where all the engineering, all the environmental impact statements, everything is completed. It is an authorized project; it was appropriated in the supplemental. The problem that I face is that the EIS requires the project be dredged at a certain time so as not to spoil the breeding time of fin fish and shellfish and that time is April.

Do I understand that I still am subjected to that May 15th date?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Two things I would say to the gentleman. I am not sure the EIS can be amended. I doubt if it can. That is out of the control of the Congress to do anything about that.

What we could do, in the regular 1986 bill, which is in the process already passed here, in the other body, I think that is one of the remedies that we can make in the 1986 bill which is in the legislation now. I believe we can correct that in the 1986 bill. Hopefully, the EIS could be amended, but that is not in our power to do that.

But we can, Congress does have the authority to change yours in the 1986 bill.

Mr. CONTE. Or quickly pass H.R. 6.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. H.R. 6, sure. But he might not be able to wait until whenever that might happen.

Mr. CARNEY. If the gentleman would yield further, at any rate, the project would still be alive through passing H.R. 6, then that May 15 date no longer is in effect?

Mr. CONTE. No.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. If the gentleman would yield further, I cannot speak for the committee or the other body, but the chairman, I am sure, is here, and he will say that we will do the best we can to get it through the bill. That is the best we can do. We will take care of the gentleman; he has been very much interested in this project, and has been a supporter of the committee. We will do everything we can to help you.

Mr. CARNEY. Thank you very much.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEVILL. I would say to the gentleman that whatever your problem is, we will solve it.

Mr. CARNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this agreement is acceptable to the administration, and provides our best opportunity in years to proceed with much needed water projects, while also effecting important cost-sharing reforms.

I urge the adoption of this amendment and this conference report.

Let me also pay special tribute to our chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi. He has worked tirelessly on this effort, and deserves all of our thanks for a job well done.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman; I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaFALCE].

Mr. LaFALCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give special praise to the distinguished chairman, JAMIE WHITTEN, and ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee SILVIO CONTE, and the Appropriation Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, TOM BEVILL and its ranking minority member JOHN MYERS, but also special praise to the chairman of the Public Works Committee JIM HOWARD, and the ranking minority member, GENE SNYDER, and the chairman of the Water Resources Subcommittee of Public Works, BOB ROE, and its ranking minority member ARLAN STANGELAND, for being so amenable to the concept of compromise in order to get projects that have been authorized for as long as 15 years, such as the Ellicott Creek project in my congressional district and Congressman JACK KEMP's congressional district.

Sometimes we thought that the circumstances were going to make this a permanent inevitability, but today's legislation is going to mean it is definitely a "go" project. That all work other than construction can take place between now and May 15, and that on May 15, construction begins. Thank you very much.

□ 1550

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in what generally has been said here in regard to the acceptance of the additional language that has been added by the other body.

We all recognize the fact, of course, that if in fact they were not sincere that they could stonewall our legislative committee past that date and get the original language, but as has been well laid out here today, at my request the chairman of our full committee has talked to the chairman of the corresponding committee in the other body and has a commitment. The chairman of our subcommittee has talked to the gentleman on Appropriations over there who has had considerable concern about his project.

They have given their word that they intend to move and enact legislation yet this year, even before the May 15 deadline. Their bill has been reported out of the legislative committee, the Committee on the Environment and Public Works, and is now over in the Finance Committee.

Our bill has been reported out of the Committee on Public Works and we are working with the other committees to which we have sequential referrals.

There is no reason at all why, with the assurances of the gentlemen in the other body that they do intend to proceed, that their motives are not such

as could be, that we should not be able to have this legislation enacted into law even by the end of this calendar year.

So with those assurances, I want to say I appreciate so very much the tolerance of the gentlemen who have handled this bill in the Committee on Appropriations with our efforts yesterday, and appreciate the efforts and support of the House in adopting the language that was put forward by the Committee on Public Works yesterday.

I think we have a reasonable solution here, and I support it.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND].

Mr. STANGELAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman and ranking republican of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, as well as my good friend and colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources.

I, too, would like to commend the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. Speaker, I, too, welcome the commitment that we are making today to enactment of a comprehensive water project authorization bill. I firmly believe that we can meet the 9-month deadline called for by the Senate amendment. What we have lacked in the past is the commitment by the Senate leadership to moving an authorization bill. In their action today, I believe that the Senate has given us that commitment and I look forward to working with them to achieve passage of the first major authorization bill in this area since 1970.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I do this to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], and all the members of the conference: Mr. BOLAND, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. YATES, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. McDADDE, Mr. MYERS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. O'BRIEN as managers on the part of the House and Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. GARN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. MATTINGLY, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. CHILES, Mr.

JOHNSTON, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SASSER, Mr. DeCONCINI, Mr. BUMPERS, and Mr. LAUTENBERG as managers on the part of the Senate.

I said earlier that I did not know of any time we have faced a tougher problem than to go into a conference with 27 Senate conferees and with 341 Senate amendments. Notwithstanding that, in three separate meetings over a period of 5 days, we got together and without exception agreement was reached by the conferees on every issue.

Not only do I wish to thank them for it, but I also wish to thank the leaders on the authorizing committee, the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation. It is time we pull together for the good of the country, and they can count on us being on their side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDGAR].

Mr. EDGAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my colleagues in the House that I support the action of the Senate, and I would urge passage of the conference report and passage of this particular issue.

Yesterday I stood on the floor and argued against the Whitten amendment and said that the procedure was unfair and the substance was unfair.

Today I take the well of the House and say that the procedure is fairer

and the substance is fairer, and I think that we can live within the 9-month pressure to get out a substantive policy bill from the authorization committee.

I want to commend my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, both majority and minority, and I want to commend my colleagues on the House Committee on Public Works authorizing committee.

I think we have increased, in the last 24 hours, the pressure in both bodies to come out with substantive reform in the area of water policy. I commend everyone for their action. I think everybody is a winner. Let us all declare victory and go home.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute only to say that this is a vital, far-reaching supplemental that covers the entire Government. I give just one instance of the importance of this supplemental. But to emphasize what this covers, let me say that it provides needed funds for important programs within the jurisdiction of all 13 appropriation subcommittees, 13 Cabinet-level agencies, the legislative branch, the Judiciary, the Postal Service, the District of Columbia, 10 major independent agencies such as the Veterans' Administration, and scores of other independent agencies. There is a real need to act rapidly. I have here a letter from the

Acting Budget Director calling attention to the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation will be out of money by August 5, which reads as follows:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As Congress prepares to adjourn for the August District Work Period, I wish to inform you that funding to support the Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation activities will be exhausted by August 5 unless Supplemental Appropriations are approved prior to the Congressional adjournment. In addition, the Federal Crop Insurance Program will cease operations the month of August if additional funds are not made available.

If funding for these programs expires, promises that have been made by the Federal government to our farmers will have been broken and hundreds of millions of dollars in assistance will be unavailable to farm families.

Accordingly, we strongly urge the Congress to act on the 1985 Supplemental Appropriations Bill prior to adjournment.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH R. WRIGHT, JR.,
Acting Director.

We need to move ahead. I urge all my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend, I am inserting a table in the RECORD at this point which compares the final conference agreement with the budget request, the House action, and the Senate action, on H.R. 2577, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985:

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House Senate | |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|------------------|
| TITLE I | | | | | | |
| CHAPTER I | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE | | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary (rescission)..... | --- | --- | -69,000 | --- | --- | +69,000 |
| Departmental administration (rescission)..... | --- | --- | -149,000 | -49,000 | -49,000 | +100,000 |
| Agricultural Research Service (rescission)..... | --- | --- | -1,000,000 | -1,000,000 | -1,000,000 | --- |
| Cooperative State Research Service..... | --- | 1,500,000 | 7,200,000 | 6,500,000 | +5,000,000 | -900,000 |
| Funds made available by P.L. 98-473..... | --- | --- | --- | (700,000) | (+700,000) | (+700,000) |
| Total: Cooperative State Research Service..... | --- | (1,500,000) | (7,200,000) | (7,200,000) | (+5,700,000) | --- |
| Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service..... | --- | 10,650,000 | 19,650,000 | 19,650,000 | +9,000,000 | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | --- | -400,000 | -400,000 | -400,000 | --- |
| Economic Research Service..... | --- | 500,000 | --- | 500,000 | --- | +500,000 |
| Rescission..... | --- | --- | -50,000 | -50,000 | -50,000 | --- |
| Statistical Reporting Service..... | 1,560,000 | 1,560,000 | 1,560,000 | 1,560,000 | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | --- | -100,000 | -100,000 | -100,000 | --- |
| Agricultural Marketing Service..... | --- | --- | 850,000 | 700,000 | +700,000 | -150,000 |
| Rescission..... | --- | --- | -150,000 | --- | --- | +150,000 |
| Packers and Stockyards Administration (rescission).... | --- | --- | -85,000 | -85,000 | -85,000 | --- |
| Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: | | | | | | |
| Subscription to capital stock..... | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal crop insurance corporation fund (authority to borrow)..... | 113,000,000 | 113,000,000 | 113,000,000 | 113,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Commodity Credit Corporation: | | | | | | |
| Reimbursement for net realized losses 1/..... | 2,935,790,000 | 3,935,790,000 | 3,935,790,000 | 2,935,790,000 | -1,000,000,000 | -1,000,000,000 |
| Farmers Home Administration: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 16,866,000 | 17,000,000 | 16,866,000 | 17,000,000 | --- | +134,000 |
| Rural Electrification Administration (rescission).... | --- | --- | -100,000 | --- | --- | +100,000 |
| Soil Conservation Service (rescission)..... | --- | --- | -2,000,000 | --- | --- | +2,000,000 |
| Food and Nutrition Service: | | | | | | |
| Food stamp program..... | 318,856,000 | 318,856,000 | 318,856,000 | 318,856,000 | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | --- | -5,000,000 | --- | --- | +5,000,000 |
| Temporary emergency food assistance program..... | --- | 4,270,000 | 10,000,000 | 7,000,000 | +2,730,000 | -3,000,000 |
| Foreign Agricultural Service (rescission)..... | --- | --- | -100,000 | -100,000 | -100,000 | --- |
| Total: Chapter I: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | 3,436,072,000 | 4,453,126,000 | 4,464,569,000 | 3,468,772,000 | -984,354,000 | -995,797,000 |
| Appropriations..... | (3,323,072,000) | (4,340,126,000) | (4,360,772,000) | (3,357,556,000) | (-982,570,000) | (-1,003,216,000) |
| Authority to borrow..... | (113,000,000) | (113,000,000) | (113,000,000) | (113,000,000) | --- | --- |
| Rescissions..... | --- | --- | -9,203,000 | -1,784,000 | -1,784,000 | +7,419,000 |
| CHAPTER II | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE | | | | | | |
| General Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 992,000 | 992,000 | 369,000 | 992,000 | --- | +623,000 |
| Rescission..... | --- | -499,000 | -499,000 | -499,000 | --- | --- |
| Bureau of The Census | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -241,000 | -241,000 | -241,000 | --- | --- |
| Periodic censuses and programs (rescission)..... | --- | --- | -791,000 | --- | --- | +791,000 |
| Economic and Statistical Analysis | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -433,000 | -433,000 | -433,000 | --- | --- |
| Economic Development Administration | | | | | | |
| Economic development assistance programs..... | --- | --- | 30,730,000 | 30,730,000 | +30,730,000 | --- |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans)..... | (-167,000,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Salaries and expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -120,000 | -120,000 | -120,000 | --- | --- |
| International Trade Administration | | | | | | |
| Operations and administration: | | | | | | |
| (Limitation on direct loans)..... | (-6,000,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans)..... | (-8,333,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participation in United States expositions (rescission)..... | --- | -6,000 | -6,000 | -6,000 | --- | --- |
| Minority Business Development Agency | | | | | | |
| Minority business development (rescission)..... | --- | -305,000 | -305,000 | -305,000 | --- | --- |
| United States Travel and Tourism Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -468,000 | -468,000 | -468,000 | --- | --- |
| 1/ Requested in the FY 1986 budget document as a permanent indefinite appropriation. | | | | | | |

1/ Requested in the FY 1986 budget document as a permanent indefinite appropriation.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House Senate | |
|--|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|--------------|
| National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration | | | | | | |
| Operations, Research and Facilities..... | 75,000,000 | --- | 126,600,000 | 126,100,000 | +126,100,000 | -500,000 |
| Fishermen's contingency fund..... | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | --- | --- |
| Fishermen's guaranty fund..... | 2,500,000 | --- | 2,500,000 | 2,500,000 | +2,500,000 | --- |
| Fisheries loan fund (rescission)..... | --- | -1,550,000 | --- | --- | +1,550,000 | --- |
| Federal ship financing fund, fishing vessels..... | 25,104,000 | 25,104,000 | 25,104,000 | 25,104,000 | --- | --- |
| Portion applied to debt reduction..... | -20,700,000 | -20,700,000 | -20,700,000 | -20,700,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Federal ship financing fund..... | 4,404,000 | 4,404,000 | 4,404,000 | 4,404,000 | --- | --- |
| Patent and Trademark Office | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -1,472,000 | -1,472,000 | -1,472,000 | --- | --- |
| National Bureau of Standards | | | | | | |
| Scientific and technical research and services (rescission)..... | --- | --- | -1,019,000 | -500,000 | -500,000 | +519,000 |
| National Telecommunications and Information Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -183,000 | -183,000 | -183,000 | --- | --- |
| Public telecommunications facilities, planning and construction (rescission)..... | --- | -32,000 | -32,000 | -32,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Department of Commerce..... | 83,396,000 | 587,000 | 159,534,000 | 160,967,000 | +160,380,000 | +1,433,000 |
| RELATED AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | | | | | | |
| Maritime Administration | | | | | | |
| Operations and Training (deferral disapproval)..... | --- | (8,500,000) | (8,500,000) | (8,500,000) | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | --- | -888,000 | --- | --- | +888,000 |
| Federal Trade Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 3,811,000 | 3,811,000 | 3,811,000 | 3,811,000 | --- | --- |
| Small Business Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -27,601,000 | -27,601,000 | -27,601,000 | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (2,400,000) | --- | --- | (2,400,000) | (+2,400,000) | (+2,400,000) |
| Business loan and investment fund..... | --- | 27,601,000 | --- | 27,601,000 | --- | +27,601,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE | | | | | | |
| General Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -166,000 | -166,000 | -166,000 | --- | --- |
| Working capital fund (rescission)..... | --- | -3,000,000 | --- | --- | +3,000,000 | --- |
| United States Parole Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | --- | 100,000 | --- | 100,000 | --- | +100,000 |
| Legal Activities | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses, general legal activities..... | 1,348,000 | 874,000 | 574,000 | 574,000 | -300,000 | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -470,000 | -470,000 | -470,000 | --- | --- |
| Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division (rescission) | --- | -65,000 | -65,000 | -65,000 | --- | --- |
| Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals..... | 9,832,000 | --- | 12,103,000 | 12,103,000 | +12,103,000 | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -889,000 | -889,000 | -889,000 | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (16,116,000) | --- | (3,000,000) | (3,000,000) | (+3,000,000) | --- |
| Fees and expenses of witnesses..... | 1,300,000 | 1,300,000 | 800,000 | 800,000 | -500,000 | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | --- | -309,000 | -309,000 | -309,000 | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (1,500,000) | (1,500,000) | (1,500,000) | (1,500,000) | --- | --- |
| Assets forfeiture fund..... | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service (rescission)..... | --- | -43,000 | -43,000 | -43,000 | --- | --- |
| Interagency Law Enforcement | | | | | | |
| Organized crime drug enforcement..... | 635,000 | 635,000 | 635,000 | 635,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Bureau of Investigation | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,500,000 | --- | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | +1,500,000 | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -3,505,000 | -3,505,000 | -3,505,000 | --- | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | Conference compared with House | Conference compared with Senate |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Drug Enforcement Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 2,700,000 | 3,300,000 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | +16,700,000 | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -876,000 | -876,000 | -876,000 | --- | --- |
| Immigration and Naturalization Service | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -947,000 | -947,000 | -947,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Prison System | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 900,000 | 900,000 | 900,000 | 900,000 | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (2,183,000) | (2,183,000) | (2,183,000) | (2,183,000) | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -451,000 | -451,000 | -451,000 | --- | --- |
| National Institute of Corrections (rescission)..... | --- | --- | -894,000 | --- | --- | +894,000 |
| Buildings and facilities (rescission)..... | --- | -13,000 | -13,000 | -13,000 | --- | --- |
| Office of Justice Programs | | | | | | |
| Justice Assistance (rescission)..... | --- | --- | -2,031,000 | --- | --- | +2,031,000 |
| Total, Department of Justice..... | 23,215,000 | 1,684,000 | 30,853,000 | 33,878,000 | +32,194,000 | +3,025,000 |
| RELATED AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| Legal Services Corporation | | | | | | |
| Payment to the Legal Services Corporation..... | --- | 4,000,000 | 8,000,000 | 8,000,000 | +4,000,000 | --- |
| Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 331,000 | 331,000 | 331,000 | 331,000 | --- | --- |
| DEPARTMENT OF STATE | | | | | | |
| Administration of Foreign Affairs | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 73,342,000 | 73,342,000 | 73,342,000 | 73,342,000 | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (13,779,000) | (13,779,000) | (11,781,000) | (12,781,000) | (-998,000) | (+1,000,000) |
| Rescission..... | --- | -2,432,000 | -2,432,000 | -2,432,000 | --- | --- |
| Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad..... | 167,579,000 | 167,579,000 | 170,579,000 | 167,579,000 | --- | -3,000,000 |
| Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad (special foreign currency program)..... | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service.... | 4,000,000 | 2,000,000 | --- | 1,000,000 | -1,000,000 | +1,000,000 |
| Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund..... | 5,399,000 | 5,399,000 | 5,399,000 | 5,399,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Department of State..... | 252,320,000 | 247,888,000 | 248,688,000 | 246,888,000 | -1,000,000 | -2,000,000 |
| International Commissions | | | | | | |
| International Fisheries Commission..... | 2,000,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | --- | (2,000,000) | (1,200,000) | (+1,200,000) | (-800,000) |
| Other | | | | | | |
| Fishermen's Protective Fund..... | 1,000,000 | --- | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | +1,000,000 | --- |
| RELATED AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| Arms Control and Disarmament Agency | | | | | | |
| Arms control and disarmament activities..... | 4,321,000 | 3,946,000 | 4,321,000 | 4,134,000 | +188,000 | -187,000 |
| Board for International Broadcasting | | | | | | |
| Grants and expenses..... | --- | 13,753,000 | --- | 13,753,000 | --- | +13,753,000 |
| Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | --- | --- | 150,000 | 75,000 | +75,000 | -75,000 |
| United States Information Agency | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -3,879,000 | -433,000 | -2,879,000 | +1,000,000 | -2,446,000 |
| Educational and Cultural Exchanges..... | --- | --- | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | +10,000,000 | --- |
| Acquisition and construction of radio facilities..... | --- | 6,648,000 | --- | 6,648,000 | --- | +6,648,000 |
| Total, United States Information Agency (net)... | --- | 2,769,000 | 9,567,000 | 13,769,000 | +11,000,000 | +4,202,000 |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Co. --- | with Senate |
|--|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| THE JUDICIARY | | | | | | |
| Supreme Court of the United States | | | | | | |
| Construction..... | 5,500,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services | | | | | | |
| Salaries of Judges..... | 3,098,000 | 3,098,000 | 3,098,000 | 3,098,000 | --- | --- |
| Salaries of supporting personnel..... | 5,548,000 | 5,548,000 | 5,548,000 | 5,548,000 | --- | --- |
| Defender services..... | 17,575,000 | 21,992,000 | 17,575,000 | 21,992,000 | --- | 14,417,000 |
| Fees of jurors and commissioners..... | 1,700,000 | 1,700,000 | 1,700,000 | 1,700,000 | --- | --- |
| Expenses of operation and maintenance of the courts... | 13,526,000 | 13,526,000 | 13,526,000 | 13,526,000 | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -4,417,000 | -4,417,000 | -4,417,000 | --- | --- |
| Space and facilities..... | 2,384,000 | 2,384,000 | 2,384,000 | 2,384,000 | --- | --- |
| Court security..... | 1,492,000 | 1,492,000 | 1,492,000 | 1,492,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services (net)..... | 45,323,000 | 45,323,000 | 40,906,000 | 45,323,000 | --- | 14,417,000 |
| Administrative Office of the United States Courts | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 86,000 | 86,000 | 86,000 | 86,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Judicial Center | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 51,000 | 51,000 | 51,000 | 51,000 | --- | --- |
| United States Sentencing Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 2,350,000 | 2,350,000 | 2,350,000 | 2,350,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, The Judiciary (net)..... | 53,310,000 | 47,810,000 | 43,393,000 | 47,810,000 | --- | 14,417,000 |
| Total, Chapter II: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority (net)... | 423,704,000 | 326,579,000 | 481,359,000 | 534,416,000 | +207,837,000 | +53,057,000 |
| Appropriations..... | (444,404,000) | (401,342,000) | (554,058,000) | (604,438,000) | (+203,096,000) | (+50,380,000) |
| Rescissions..... | --- | (-54,065,000) | (-51,999,000) | (-49,322,000) | (+4,741,000) | (+2,677,000) |
| Appropriation for debt reduction..... | (-20,700,000) | (-20,700,000) | (-20,700,000) | (-20,700,000) | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (35,978,000) | (17,462,000) | (20,444,000) | (23,064,000) | (+5,602,000) | (+2,600,000) |
| (Limitation on direct loans)..... | (-6,000,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on loan guarantees)..... | (-175,333,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Deferral disapproval)..... | --- | (8,500,000) | (8,500,000) | (8,500,000) | --- | --- |
| CHAPTER III | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE--MILITARY | | | | | | |
| PROCUREMENT | | | | | | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy (by transfer)..... | --- | (240,000,000) | --- | --- | (-240,000,000) | --- |
| Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy 1981/1985 (by transfer to United States Coast Guard, Acquisition, construction, and improvements) 1/..... | --- | --- | (6,240,000) | (6,240,000) | (+6,240,000) | --- |
| RELATED AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| Humanitarian Assistance for Nicaraguan Democratic Resistance..... | --- | --- | 24,000,000 | --- | --- | -24,000,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | --- | (14,000,000) | --- | --- | (-14,000,000) |
| Enhanced security countermeasures capabilities..... | --- | --- | 50,000,000 | 35,000,000 | +35,000,000 | -15,000,000 |
| Total, Chapter III: | --- | --- | 74,000,000 | 35,000,000 | +35,000,000 | -39,000,000 |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | --- | --- | 74,000,000 | 35,000,000 | +35,000,000 | -39,000,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | (240,000,000) | (14,000,000) | --- | (-240,000,000) | (-14,000,000) |
| CHAPTER IV | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL | | | | | | |
| Department of the Army | | | | | | |
| Corps of Engineers - Civil | | | | | | |
| Construction, general (new starts)..... | --- | 50,000,000 | 48,000,000 | 48,000,000 | -2,000,000 | --- |
| Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee (new starts)... | --- | 1,000,000 | 800,000 | 800,000 | -200,000 | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | --- | -1,000,000 | --- | --- | +1,000,000 |
| General investigations..... | --- | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | --- | -2,000,000 | --- | --- | +2,000,000 |

1/ Transfer out not counted in Chapter III, but
is counted in Chapter X (Dept. of Transportation).

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House Senate | |
|---|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|---------------|
| Construction, general..... | --- | 7,500,000 | 22,500,000 | 22,500,000 | +15,000,000 | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | --- | -4,000,000 | --- | --- | +4,000,000 |
| Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies..... | --- | 25,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 25,000,000 | --- | +15,000,000 |
| Operation and maintenance, general..... | --- | 2,600,000 | --- | 2,600,000 | --- | +2,600,000 |
| Rescission..... | --- | --- | -8,000,000 | --- | --- | +8,000,000 |
| Total, Department of Defense - Civil..... | --- | 87,300,000 | 67,500,000 | 100,100,000 | +12,800,000 | +32,600,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR | | | | | | |
| Bureau of Reclamation | | | | | | |
| Construction program (new starts)..... | --- | 20,850,000 | 14,300,000 | 14,300,000 | -6,550,000 | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | --- | -2,571,000 | --- | --- | +2,571,000 |
| Operation and maintenance (rescission)..... | --- | --- | -1,540,000 | --- | --- | +1,540,000 |
| INDEPENDENT AGENCY | | | | | | |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | | | | | | |
| Tennessee Valley Authority Fund..... | --- | 5,000,000 | --- | 5,000,000 | --- | +5,000,000 |
| Rescission..... | --- | --- | -1,538,000 | --- | --- | +1,538,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY | | | | | | |
| Energy supply, R&D activities (rescission)..... | --- | --- | -2,676,000 | --- | --- | +2,676,000 |
| Atomic energy defense activities (rescission)..... | --- | --- | -8,280,000 | -8,280,000 | -8,280,000 | --- |
| Departmental administration (rescission)..... | --- | --- | -2,786,000 | --- | --- | +2,786,000 |
| Total, Department of Energy..... | --- | --- | -13,742,000 | -8,280,000 | -8,280,000 | +5,462,000 |
| Total, Chapter IV: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | --- | 113,150,000 | 62,409,000 | 111,120,000 | -2,030,000 | +48,711,000 |
| Appropriations..... | --- | (113,150,000) | (96,800,000) | (119,400,000) | +46,250,000 | (+22,600,000) |
| Rescissions..... | --- | --- | (-34,391,000) | (-8,280,000) | (-8,280,000) | (+26,111,000) |
| CHAPTER V | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN ASSISTANCE | | | | | | |
| FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT | | | | | | |
| Multilateral Economic Assistance | | | | | | |
| International Financial Institutions | | | | | | |
| World Bank Group | | | | | | |
| Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development: | | | | | | |
| Paid-in capital..... | 30,000,925 | 30,000,925 | 30,000,925 | 30,000,925 | --- | --- |
| Limitation on callable capital subscriptions.... | (370,023,735) | (370,023,735) | (370,023,735) | (370,023,735) | --- | --- |
| Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank: | | | | | | |
| Fund for special operations..... | 72,500,000 | 72,500,000 | 72,500,000 | 72,500,000 | --- | --- |
| Inter-American Investment Corporation..... | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Inter-regional paid-in capital..... | 40,001,171 | 40,001,171 | 40,001,171 | 40,001,171 | --- | --- |
| Limitation on callable capital subscriptions.... | (849,000,244) | (849,000,244) | (849,000,244) | (849,000,244) | --- | --- |
| Contribution to the Asian Development Bank: | | | | | | |
| Development fund..... | 91,232,340 | 91,232,340 | 91,232,340 | 91,232,340 | --- | --- |
| Total, International Financial Institutions..... | 236,734,436 | 236,734,436 | 236,734,436 | 236,734,436 | --- | --- |
| Department of State | | | | | | |
| International organizations and programs: | | | | | | |
| (By transfer)..... | (5,686,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (By transfer: unobligated balances)..... | --- | (5,686,000) | (2,843,000) | (3,600,000) | (-2,086,000) | (+757,000) |
| Bilateral Economic Assistance | | | | | | |
| Agency for International Development | | | | | | |
| Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund..... | 1,302,000 | 1,302,000 | 1,302,000 | 1,302,000 | --- | --- |
| Economic support fund..... | 2,258,000,000 | 2,008,000,000 | 2,258,000,000 | 2,258,000,000 | +250,000,000 | --- |
| African Development Foundation | | | | | | |
| Appropriations (deferral disapproval)..... | --- | (2,287,000) | (2,287,000) | (2,287,000) | --- | --- |
| Funds Appropriated to the President | | | | | | |
| Nicaragua | | | | | | |
| Nicaraguan humanitarian assistance..... | --- | 27,000,000 | --- | 27,000,000 | --- | +27,000,000 |
| Assistance for implementation of a Contadora agreement | --- | 2,000,000 | --- | 2,000,000 | --- | +2,000,000 |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House | Senate |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|--------------|
| Department of State | | | | | | |
| Migration and Refugee Assistance (by transfer)..... | --- | --- | (12,500,000) | (12,500,000) | (+12,500,000) | --- |
| Total, Chapter VI: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | 2,496,036,436 | 2,275,036,436 | 2,496,036,436 | 2,525,036,436 | +250,000,000 | +29,000,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | (5,686,000) | (5,686,000) | (15,343,000) | (16,100,000) | (+10,414,000) | (+757,000) |
| (Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)..... | (1,219,023,979) | (1,219,023,979) | (1,219,023,979) | (1,219,023,979) | --- | --- |
| CHAPTER VI | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT | | | | | | |
| Housing Programs | | | | | | |
| Rental housing assistance (rescission of contract authority, indefinite)..... | -528,940,000 | -528,940,000 | -528,940,000 | -528,940,000 | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)..... | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | --- | --- |
| Payments for operation of low-income housing projects (rescission)..... | --- | -75,000,000 | --- | --- | +75,000,000 | --- |
| Management and Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -6,919,000 | -6,919,000 | -6,919,000 | --- | --- |
| Salaries and expenses (by transfer)..... | (2,671,000) | --- | (4,000,000) | (4,000,000) | (+4,000,000) | --- |
| CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | --- | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | --- | --- |
| ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | --- | 5,000,000 | --- | 4,000,000 | -1,000,000 | +4,000,000 |
| Research and development (rescission)..... | --- | -4,125,000 | --- | -4,125,000 | --- | -4,125,000 |
| Abatement, control and compliance..... | --- | 15,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 20,000,000 | +5,000,000 | -5,000,000 |
| Buildings and facilities..... | --- | --- | 500,000 | 500,000 | +500,000 | --- |
| EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT | | | | | | |
| Office of Science and Technology Policy..... | --- | --- | 120,000 | 120,000 | +120,000 | --- |
| FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -786,000 | -786,000 | -786,000 | --- | --- |
| Salaries and expenses (by transfer)..... | (3,100,000) | --- | (3,100,000) | (1,105,000) | (+1,105,000) | (-1,995,000) |
| Emergency management planning and assistance (rescission)..... | --- | -1,287,000 | -1,287,000 | -1,287,000 | --- | --- |
| Emergency food and shelter program..... | --- | --- | 110,000,000 | 20,000,000 | +20,000,000 | -90,000,000 |
| GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | |
| Consumer Information Center (rescission)..... | --- | -63,000 | -63,000 | -63,000 | --- | --- |
| NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | |
| Research and development..... | --- | --- | 40,000,000 | 40,000,000 | +40,000,000 | --- |
| Research and program management (rescission)..... | --- | -6,000,000 | -6,000,000 | -6,000,000 | --- | --- |
| NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION | | | | | | |
| Research and related activities..... | --- | --- | 100,000 | 100,000 | +100,000 | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -1,000,000 | -1,000,000 | -1,000,000 | --- | --- |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY | | | | | | |
| Office of Revenue Sharing, salaries and expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -90,000 | -100,000 | -100,000 | -10,000 | --- |
| VETERANS ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | |
| Compensation and pensions..... | 175,000,000 | 175,000,000 | 175,000,000 | 175,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Readjustment benefits..... | --- | 44,200,000 | --- | --- | -44,200,000 | --- |
| Medical Care (rescission)..... | --- | --- | -3,520,000 | -3,520,000 | -3,520,000 | --- |
| Medical and prosthetic research (rescission)..... | --- | -150,000 | --- | --- | +150,000 | --- |
| Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -2,109,000 | -1,322,000 | -2,109,000 | --- | -787,000 |
| General operating expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -2,000,000 | --- | --- | +2,000,000 | --- |
| Construction, minor projects (rescission)..... | --- | -377,000 | --- | -377,000 | --- | -377,000 |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (H.R. 2044)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | Conference compared with | |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | House | Senate |
| Total, Chapter VII: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | -353,940,000 | -353,940,000 | -198,717,000 | -295,006,000 | +94,140,000 | -96,289,000 |
| Appropriations..... | (175,000,000) | (295,700,000) | (351,220,000) | (260,220,000) | (+20,520,000) | (-71,000,000) |
| Rescissions..... | --- | (-39,900,000) | (-20,997,000) | (-26,286,000) | (+73,620,000) | (-5,289,000) |
| Rescission of contract authority..... | (-528,940,000) | (-528,940,000) | (-528,940,000) | (-528,940,000) | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (5,771,000) | --- | (7,100,000) | (5,105,000) | (+5,105,000) | (-1,995,000) |
| Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)..... | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | --- | --- |
| CHAPTER VII | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR | | | | | | |
| Bureau of Land Management | | | | | | |
| Management of lands and resources..... | --- | 45,500,000 | 45,500,000 | 45,500,000 | 45,500,000 | 45,500,000 |
| Rescission..... | --- | -490,000 | -2,900,000 | -2,900,000 | --- | --- |
| Land acquisition (by transfer)..... | (2,000,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Construction and access..... | --- | --- | 825,000 | 825,000 | +825,000 | --- |
| Oregon and California grant lands (By transfer)..... | (3,000,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | 0,000 | -350,000 | -350,000 | --- | --- |
| Working capital fund (rescission)..... | --- | 2,951,000 | 2,951,000 | 2,951,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Bureau of Land Management (net)..... | --- | 42,951,000 | 40,124,000 | 43,124,000 | +71,325,000 | +70,000,000 |
| United States Fish and Wildlife Service | | | | | | |
| Resource management..... | --- | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -1,900,000 | -1,900,000 | -1,900,000 | --- | --- |
| Construction and anadromous fish (By transfer)..... | (4,000,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | --- | --- |
| Land acquisition..... | --- | --- | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | +1,000,000 | --- |
| Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service (net)..... | --- | 10,000 | 260,000 | 260,000 | +1,000,000 | --- |
| National Park Service | | | | | | |
| Operation of the national park system..... | --- | 9,560,000 | 9,560,000 | 9,560,000 | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -4,300,000 | -4,300,000 | -4,300,000 | --- | --- |
| National Recreation and Preservation (rescission)..... | --- | --- | -94,000 | --- | --- | +94,000 |
| Construction (rescission)..... | --- | -397,000 | -397,000 | -397,000 | --- | --- |
| Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority)..... | --- | -30,000,000 | -30,000,000 | -30,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Construction (trust fund) (deferral disapproval)..... | --- | 34,672,000 | 34,672,000 | 34,672,000 | --- | --- |
| Land acquisition and state assistance..... | --- | --- | 22,000,000 | 22,000,000 | +22,000,000 | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (3,216,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | --- | -52,000 | -52,000 | -52,000 | --- |
| Total, National Park Service (net)..... | --- | 35,127,000 | 3,283,000 | 3,189,000 | +21,948,000 | +94,000 |
| Geological Survey | | | | | | |
| Surveys, investigations, and research (rescission)..... | --- | -1,269,000 | -1,269,000 | -1,269,000 | --- | --- |
| Minerals Management Service | | | | | | |
| Leasing and royalty management (rescission)..... | --- | -1,764,000 | -1,764,000 | -1,764,000 | --- | --- |
| Payments to States from receipts under Mineral Leasing | 800,000 | 0,000 | 800,000 | 800,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Minerals Management Service (net)..... | 800,000 | -964,000 | -964,000 | -964,000 | --- | --- |
| Bureau of Mines | | | | | | |
| Mines and minerals (effect of new deferral)..... | --- | 1,355,000 | 1,355,000 | 1,355,000 | --- | --- |
| Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement | | | | | | |
| Regulation and technology..... | 4,800,000 | 4,800,000 | 4,800,000 | 4,800,000 | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | --- | -546,000 | --- | --- | +546,000 |
| Abandoned mine reclamation fund (effect of new deferral)..... | --- | 3,233,000 | 1,323,000 | 1,323,000 | --- | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- | |
|--|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | House | Senate |
| Bureau of Indian Affairs | | | | | | |
| Operation of Indian Programs..... | --- | 19,800,000 | 23,423,000 | 23,423,000 | 43,605,000 | --- |
| Proposed transfer 1/..... | (4,900,000) | (4,900,000) | --- | (4,900,000) | --- | (4,900,000) |
| Proposed transfer 2/..... | --- | --- | (4,900,000) | --- | --- | (4,900,000) |
| Rescission..... | --- | 2,800,000 | -2,800,000 | -2,800,000 | --- | --- |
| Construction (by transfer)..... | (12,850,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Deferral disapproval)..... | --- | (8,025,000) | (8,025,000) | (8,025,000) | --- | --- |
| (Effect of new deferral)..... | --- | 7,000,000 | --- | (-3,000,000) | --- | (-3,000,000) |
| Utah Paiute Trust Fund..... | --- | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs (net)..... | --- | 17,008,000 | 20,673,000 | 20,673,000 | 43,605,000 | --- |
| Territorial and International Affairs | | | | | | |
| Administration of territories..... | 1,994,000 | 1,994,000 | 1,994,000 | 1,994,000 | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -107,000 | -107,000 | -107,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Territorial and International Affairs (net)..... | 1,994,000 | 1,887,000 | 1,887,000 | 1,887,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Department of the Interior (net)..... | 7,594,000 | 21,095,000 | 61,682,000 | 132,322,000 | 47,787,000 | 470,640,000 |
| RELATED AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE | | | | | | |
| Forest Service | | | | | | |
| Forest research (rescission)..... | --- | -462,000 | -462,000 | -462,000 | --- | --- |
| State and private forestry (rescission)..... | --- | -232,000 | -232,000 | -232,000 | --- | --- |
| National forest system..... | 61,247,000 | 61,247,000 | 62,140,000 | 61,247,000 | --- | -893,000 |
| Rescission..... | --- | -6,067,000 | -6,067,000 | -6,067,000 | --- | --- |
| Construction..... | --- | 1,568,000 | 675,000 | 1,568,000 | --- | 1,893,000 |
| Rescission..... | --- | -961,000 | -961,000 | -961,000 | --- | --- |
| Land acquisition..... | --- | 7,000,000 | 7,000,000 | 7,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -68,000 | -68,000 | -68,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Forest Service (net)..... | 61,247,000 | 55,075,000 | 62,025,000 | 62,025,000 | 47,000,000 | --- |
| DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY | | | | | | |
| Fossil energy research and development (deferral disapproval)..... | --- | (8,350,000) | (8,350,000) | (39,154,000) | (4229,000) | (430,804,000) |
| Rescission..... | --- | -1,600,000 | --- | --- | --- | 41,600,000 |
| (Effect of new deferral)..... | --- | --- | --- | (-1,600,000) | (-1,600,000) | (-1,600,000) |
| Fossil energy construction (effect of new deferral)..... | --- | (-860,000) | (-860,000) | (-860,000) | --- | --- |
| Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves (effect of new deferral)..... | --- | (-181,000) | (-181,000) | (-181,000) | --- | --- |
| Economic regulation (rescission)..... | --- | -102,000 | -102,000 | -102,000 | --- | --- |
| Emergency preparedness (rescission)..... | --- | -51,000 | -51,000 | -51,000 | --- | --- |
| Strategic petroleum reserve (deferral disapproval)..... | --- | (270,738,000) | (270,738,000) | (270,738,000) | --- | --- |
| Strategic petroleum reserve (effect of new deferral)..... | --- | (-156,000) | (-156,000) | (-156,000) | --- | --- |
| BPR petroleum account (deferral disapproval)..... | --- | (8,402,316) | --- | (290,070,000) | (-536,958,316) | (4290,070,000) |
| Alternative fuels production (effect of new deferral)..... | --- | (-23,000) | (-23,000) | (-23,000) | --- | --- |
| Total, Department of Energy (net)..... | --- | -153,000 | -1,753,000 | -153,000 | --- | 41,600,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES | | | | | | |
| Health Services Administration | | | | | | |
| Indian health services (rescission)..... | --- | -161,000 | -161,000 | -161,000 | --- | --- |
| SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | --- | --- | 300,000 | --- | --- | -300,000 |
| National Gallery of Art | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | --- | --- | 400,000 | 400,000 | 400,000 | --- |
| Total, Chapter VIII: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority (net).... | 68,841,000 | 89,453,000 | 122,493,000 | 194,433,000 | 4105,278,000 | 471,940,000 |
| Appropriations..... | (68,841,000) | (46,037,000) | (181,667,000) | (251,367,000) | (4105,330,000) | (469,700,000) |
| Rescissions..... | --- | 1,568,000 | (-39,174,000) | (-56,934,000) | (-52,000) | (42,240,000) |
| (By transfer)..... | (29,966,000) | (4,900,000) | (4,900,000) | (4,900,000) | --- | --- |
| (Deferral disapproval)..... | --- | (1,175,398,316) | (321,785,000) | (642,659,000) | (-536,729,316) | (4320,874,000) |
| (Effect of new deferral)..... | --- | (-8,008,000) | (-5,808,000) | (-10,408,000) | (-1,600,000) | (-4,600,000) |

1/ Proposed transfer from National Capital Region

Arts and Cultural Affairs program.

2/ Proposed transfer from Road Construction.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- | |
|---|----------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | House | Senate |
| CHAPTER VIII | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF LABOR | | | | | | |
| Employment and Training Administration | | | | | | |
| Program administration (limitation on trust fund transfer)..... | (-162,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Training and Employment Services..... | --- | --- | 5,117,000 | 5,117,000 | +5,117,000 | --- |
| State Unemployment Insurance and employment service operations: | | | | | | |
| (Limitation on trust fund transfer)..... | (-40,767,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on trust fund transfer)..... | --- | (30,000,000) | --- | (20,000,000) | (-10,000,000) | (+20,000,000) |
| Departmental Management | | | | | | |
| Assistant Secretary for Veterans Employment and Training (limitation on trust fund transfer)..... | (-119,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total, Department of Labor: | | | | | | |
| Federal funds..... | --- | --- | 5,117,000 | 5,117,000 | +5,117,000 | --- |
| Trust funds..... | (-41,048,000) | (30,000,000) | --- | (20,000,000) | (-10,000,000) | (+20,000,000) |
| DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES | | | | | | |
| Health Resources and Services Administration | | | | | | |
| Health resources and services..... | --- | --- | 3,200,000 | 2,000,000 | +2,000,000 | -1,200,000 |
| HMO Loan & Loan Guaranty Fund..... | --- | --- | 1,720,000 | 1,720,000 | +1,720,000 | --- |
| Centers for Disease Control | | | | | | |
| Disease control..... | --- | --- | 5,000,000 | --- | --- | -5,000,000 |
| National Institutes of Health | | | | | | |
| National Cancer Institute..... | --- | --- | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | +3,000,000 | --- |
| Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration | | | | | | |
| Alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health..... | --- | --- | 1,000,000 | --- | --- | -1,000,000 |
| Social Security Administration | | | | | | |
| Payments to social security trust funds..... | 3,500,000,000 | 3,500,000,000 | 3,500,000,000 | 3,500,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Limitation on administrative expenses (trust funds)... | (-9,176,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Office of Human Development Services | | | | | | |
| Family Social Services: | | | | | | |
| Entitlement activities..... | 43,904,000 | 79,495,000 | 79,495,000 | 79,495,000 | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (2,500,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (By transfer; unobligated balances)..... | (33,091,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Human Development Services..... | --- | 6,000,000 | 16,000,000 | 11,000,000 | +5,000,000 | -5,000,000 |
| Total, Department of Health and Human Services.. | 3,543,904,000 | 3,585,495,000 | 3,609,415,000 | 3,597,215,000 | +11,720,000 | -12,200,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION | | | | | | |
| Rehabilitation Services and Handicapped Research..... | --- | --- | 715,000 | 715,000 | +715,000 | --- |
| Vocational & Adult Education..... | --- | --- | 148,220,000 | 101,943,000 | +101,943,000 | -46,257,000 |
| Libraries..... | --- | --- | 5,000,000 | --- | --- | -5,000,000 |
| Office of Postsecondary Education | | | | | | |
| Student financial assistance..... | --- | 287,000,000 | 289,482,000 | 289,482,000 | +2,482,000 | --- |
| Guaranteed student loans..... | 664,846,000 | 720,346,000 | 720,346,000 | 720,346,000 | --- | --- |
| RELATED AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| Railroad Retirement Board: | | | | | | |
| (Limitation on administration)..... | (-3,098,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| United States Institute of Peace (deferral disapproval)..... | --- | --- | (4,000,000) | (4,000,000) | (+4,000,000) | --- |
| Total, Chapter VIII: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | 4,208,750,000 | 4,592,841,000 | 4,778,295,000 | 4,714,838,000 | +121,997,000 | -63,457,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | (35,591,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on administration)..... | (-12,274,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on trust fund transfer)..... | (-41,048,000) | (30,000,000) | --- | (20,000,000) | (-10,000,000) | (+20,000,000) |
| (Deferral disapproval)..... | --- | --- | (4,000,000) | (4,000,000) | (+4,000,000) | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House Senate |
|---|-------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| CHAPTER IX | | | | | |
| LEGISLATIVE BRANCH | | | | | |
| SENATE | | | | | |
| Expense Allowances for the Vice President Pro Tempore; Majority and Minority leaders; Majority and Minority Whips; and the Chairmen of the Majority and Minority Conference Committees Chairman of the conference of the majority; Chairman of the conference of the minority..... | 6,000 | --- | 6,000 | 6,000 | +6,000 |
| Salaries, Officers and Employees Administrative, clerical, and legislative assistance to Senators..... | 1,136,000 | --- | 1,136,000 | 1,136,000 | +1,136,000 |
| Representation allowances for the Majority and Minority Leaders..... | --- | --- | 20,000 | 20,000 | +20,000 |
| Contingent Expenses of the Senate | | | | | |
| Inquiries and investigations..... | 3,448,000 | --- | --- | 3,000,000 | +3,000,000 |
| Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate..... | 4,708,000 | --- | 7,258,000 | 7,258,000 | +7,258,000 |
| Total, Senate..... | 9,298,000 | --- | 8,420,000 | 11,420,000 | +11,420,000 |
| HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | | | | | |
| Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress | | | | | |
| Gratuities, deceased Members..... | --- | 75,100 | 75,100 | 75,100 | --- |
| Salaries, Officers and Employees | | | | | |
| Office of the Postmaster..... | 130,000 | 130,000 | 130,000 | 130,000 | --- |
| Committee Employees | | | | | |
| Professional and clerical employees (standing committees)..... | 2,799,000 | 2,799,000 | 2,799,000 | 2,799,000 | --- |
| Allowances and Expenses | | | | | |
| Official Expenses of Members..... | 5,603,000 | 5,603,000 | 5,603,000 | 5,603,000 | --- |
| Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims..... | 250,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Stenographic reporting of committee hearings..... | 100,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Miscellaneous items..... | 122,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total, House of Representatives..... | 9,004,000 | 8,607,100 | 8,607,100 | 8,607,100 | --- |
| JOINT ITEMS | | | | | |
| Official Mail Costs | | | | | |
| Expenses..... | 11,853,000 | 11,853,000 | 11,853,000 | 11,853,000 | --- |
| GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 6,121,000 | --- | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | +5,000,000 |
| Total, Chapter IX: New budget (obligational) authority..... | 36,276,000 | 20,460,100 | 33,880,100 | 36,880,100 | +16,420,000 |
| CHAPTER X | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary | | | | | |
| Working capital fund (decrease in limitation on working capital fund)..... | --- | (-30,000) | (-1,000,000) | (-1,000,000) | (-970,000) |
| Coast Guard | | | | | |
| Operating expenses..... | --- | --- | 1,500,000 | --- | -1,500,000 |
| Acquisition, construction, and improvements..... | --- | --- | 27,700,000 | 27,700,000 | --- |
| (By transfer from Shipbuilding, Navy)..... | --- | --- | (6,240,000) | (6,240,000) | --- |
| Alteration of bridges..... | 8,400,000 | 8,400,000 | 8,400,000 | 8,400,000 | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1986 (H.R. 2377)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- | |
|---|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------------------|--------------|
| | | | | | House | Senate |
| Federal Aviation Administration | | | | | | |
| Operations..... | --- | --- | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 12,000,000 | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (15,000,000) | --- | (15,000,000) | (15,000,000) | (15,000,000) | --- |
| Facilities and equipment (Airport and airway trust fund) (rescission)..... | --- | -10,000,000 | -12,000,000 | -12,000,000 | -2,000,000 | --- |
| Federal Highway Administration | | | | | | |
| (Decrease in limitation on general operating expenses) | --- | (-439,000) | (-439,000) | (-439,000) | --- | --- |
| Railroad-highway crossings demonstration projects..... | --- | 5,300,000 | 9,140,000 | 14,440,000 | 19,340,000 | 15,300,000 |
| Motor carrier safety (rescission)..... | --- | -164,000 | -164,000 | -164,000 | --- | --- |
| National Highway Traffic Safety Administration | | | | | | |
| Operations and research | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (7,200,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -908,000 | -908,000 | -908,000 | --- | --- |
| Seat belt and passive restraint program (rescission)..... | --- | -7,500,000 | -2,000,000 | -7,500,000 | --- | -5,500,000 |
| Highway traffic safety grants (rescission)..... | --- | -250,000 | -250,000 | -250,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Railroad Administration | | | | | | |
| Railroad research and development (rescission)..... | --- | -170,000 | -170,000 | -170,000 | --- | --- |
| Rail service assistance..... | 48,932,000 | 1,932,000 | 48,932,000 | 48,932,000 | --- | --- |
| Appropriation for debt reduction..... | -60,281,000 | -3,281,000 | -60,281,000 | -60,281,000 | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -90,000 | -90,000 | -90,000 | --- | --- |
| Settlements of railroad litigation..... | 4,328,000 | 1,328,000 | 4,328,000 | 4,328,000 | --- | --- |
| Appropriation for debt reduction..... | -4,223,000 | -1,223,000 | -4,223,000 | -4,223,000 | --- | --- |
| Northeast corridor improvement program (rescission)... (Deferral disapproval)..... | --- | -200,000 | -200,000 | -200,000 | --- | --- |
| Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financial Funds (limitation on new loan guarantees)..... | --- | (6,500,000) | --- | (6,500,000) | --- | (16,500,000) |
| Total, Federal Railroad Administration (net).... | 8,756,000 | 8,296,000 | 8,296,000 | 8,296,000 | --- | --- |
| Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation | | | | | | |
| (Decrease in limitation on administrative expenses)... | --- | (-30,000) | (-30,000) | (-30,000) | --- | --- |
| Research and Special Programs Administration | | | | | | |
| Research and special programs (by transfer)..... | (850,000) | (425,000) | (700,000) | (650,000) | (1,225,000) | (-130,000) |
| Total, Department of Transportation (net)..... | 17,156,000 | 3,274,000 | 42,014,000 | 40,314,000 | 127,040,000 | -1,700,000 |
| RELATED AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 4,463,000 | 3,150,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,100,000 | -1,950,000 | (199,000) |
| Panama Canal Commission | | | | | | |
| Capital outlay (by transfer)..... | (3,900,000) | (2,220,000) | (1,700,000) | (1,700,000) | (-320,000) | --- |
| Payments to the Republic of Panama (by transfer) 1/... | (2,186,000) | (2,186,000) | (2,705,000) | (2,705,000) | (1519,000) | --- |
| Total, Chapter XI | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | 21,619,000 | 6,424,000 | 44,014,000 | 42,414,000 | 135,990,000 | -1,600,000 |
| Appropriations..... | (86,123,000) | (9,110,000) | (124,200,000) | (128,100,000) | (137,990,000) | (13,900,000) |
| Rescissions..... | --- | (-1,182,000) | (-15,682,000) | (-21,182,000) | (-2,980,000) | (-5,500,000) |
| Appropriations for debt reduction..... | (-64,504,000) | (-64,504,000) | (-64,504,000) | (-64,504,000) | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (29,136,000) | (1,831,000) | (26,345,000) | (26,295,000) | (121,464,000) | (-30,000) |
| (Change in limitation on administrative expenses)..... | --- | (-469,000) | (-469,000) | (-469,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on Working capital fund)..... | --- | (-30,000) | (-1,000,000) | (-1,000,000) | (-970,000) | --- |
| (Deferral disapproval)..... | --- | --- | (30,000,000) | (30,000,000) | (130,000,000) | --- |
| CHAPTER XI | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY | | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary (rescission)..... | --- | -969,000 | -969,000 | -969,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (rescission)... | --- | -75,000 | -75,000 | -75,000 | --- | --- |
| Financial Management Services: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 10,040,000 | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -972,000 | -972,000 | -972,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Financial Management Service (net)..... | 10,040,000 | 9,028,000 | 9,028,000 | 9,028,000 | --- | --- |

1/ Senate considered request of 2,705,000 based on informal amended request (May 9).

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House Senate | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|---------------|
| Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms..... | 1,900,000 | 1,900,000 | 1,900,000 | 1,900,000 | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -397,000 | -397,000 | -397,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (net)..... | 1,900,000 | 1,503,000 | 1,503,000 | 1,503,000 | --- | --- |
| United States Customs Service: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 2,200,000 | 2,800,000 | 14,400,000 | 15,000,000 | +12,200,000 | +600,000 |
| Rescission..... | --- | -1,223,000 | -1,223,000 | -1,223,000 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, Customs operating accounts (net)..... | 2,200,000 | 1,577,000 | 13,177,000 | 13,777,000 | +12,200,000 | +600,000 |
| Operations and maintenance, air interdiction program..... | --- | --- | 11,000,000 | 11,000,000 | +11,000,000 | --- |
| Customs forfeiture fund..... | 6,000,000 | 6,000,000 | 6,000,000 | 6,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Customs services at small airports..... | 42,000 | 42,000 | 42,000 | 42,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, United States Customs Service (net)..... | 8,242,000 | 7,619,000 | 30,219,000 | 30,819,000 | +23,200,000 | +600,000 |
| Bureau of the Mint (rescission)..... | --- | -87,000 | -87,000 | -87,000 | --- | --- |
| Bureau of the Public Debt (rescission)..... | --- | -52,000 | -52,000 | -52,000 | --- | --- |
| Internal Revenue Service: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -198,000 | -198,000 | -198,000 | --- | --- |
| Processing tax returns (rescission)..... | --- | -781,000 | -781,000 | -781,000 | --- | --- |
| Examinations and appeals (rescission)..... | --- | -1,588,000 | -1,588,000 | -1,588,000 | --- | --- |
| Investigations, collections and taxpayer service.. | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -1,633,000 | -1,633,000 | -1,633,000 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, IRS operating accounts (net)..... | 2,400,000 | -1,800,000 | -1,800,000 | -1,800,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal tax lien revolving fund..... | 9,000,000 | 9,000,000 | 9,000,000 | 9,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Internal Revenue Service (net)..... | 11,400,000 | 7,200,000 | 7,200,000 | 7,200,000 | --- | --- |
| United States Secret Service..... | 4,100,000 | 4,400,000 | 5,400,000 | 5,400,000 | +1,000,000 | --- |
| Rescission..... | --- | -1,465,000 | -1,465,000 | -1,465,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, United States Secret Service (net)..... | 4,100,000 | 2,935,000 | 3,935,000 | 3,935,000 | +1,000,000 | --- |
| Total, Department of the Treasury (net)..... | 35,682,000 | 27,102,000 | 50,702,000 | 51,302,000 | +24,200,000 | +600,000 |
| UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE | | | | | | |
| Payment to the Postal Service Fund..... | --- | 168,620,000 | 168,620,000 | 168,620,000 | --- | --- |
| EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT | | | | | | |
| National Critical Materials Council..... | --- | 200,000 | --- | 200,000 | --- | +200,000 |
| INDEPENDENT AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| General Services Administration | | | | | | |
| Federal Buildings Fund: | | | | | | |
| Limitation on availability of revenues: | | | | | | |
| New construction..... | --- | (22,617,000) | --- | (22,617,000) | --- | (+22,617,000) |
| Construction and acquisition of facilities..... | (4,225,000) | (7,225,000) | (4,225,000) | (7,225,000) | --- | (+3,000,000) |
| Alterations and major repairs..... | --- | (1,108,000) | --- | (1,108,000) | --- | (+1,108,000) |
| Real property operations (transfer to construction and acquisition of facilities)... | --- | (-3,000,000) | --- | (-3,000,000) | --- | (-3,000,000) |
| Design and construction services..... | --- | (83,000) | --- | (83,000) | --- | (+83,000) |
| Subtotal, Federal Buildings Fund..... | (4,225,000) | (28,033,000) | (4,225,000) | (28,033,000) | --- | (+23,808,000) |
| Real property activities (rescission)..... | --- | -2,000,000 | -2,000,000 | -2,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Programs direction (rescission)..... | --- | -1,204,000 | -1,204,000 | -1,204,000 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, Federal Buildings Fund (net)..... | --- | -3,204,000 | -3,204,000 | -3,204,000 | --- | --- |
| Personal Property Activities: | | | | | | |
| Personal property operating expenses (rescission)... | --- | -300,000 | -300,000 | -300,000 | --- | --- |
| General supply fund (rescission)..... | --- | -30,848,000 | -30,848,000 | -30,848,000 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, Personal Property Activities (net).... | --- | -31,148,000 | -31,148,000 | -31,148,000 | --- | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House Senate | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|----------------------|
| Federal Property Resources Activities: | | | | | | |
| Operating expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -207,000 | -207,000 | -207,000 | --- | --- |
| Expenses, disposal of surplus real and related property (rescission)..... | --- | -1,832,000 | -1,832,000 | -1,832,000 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, Federal Property Resources Activities (net)..... | --- | -2,039,000 | -2,039,000 | -2,039,000 | --- | --- |
| General Activities: | | | | | | |
| General Management and Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and Expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -403,000 | -403,000 | -403,000 | --- | --- |
| Office of Information Resources Management: | | | | | | |
| Operating Expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -45,000 | -45,000 | -45,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal telecommunications fund (rescission)... | --- | -415,000 | -415,000 | -415,000 | --- | --- |
| Automatic data processing fund (rescission)... | --- | -145,000 | -145,000 | -145,000 | --- | --- |
| Office of the Inspector General (rescission)..... | --- | -35,000 | -35,000 | -35,000 | --- | --- |
| Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents (rescission)..... | --- | -19,000 | -19,000 | -19,000 | --- | --- |
| Working capital fund (rescission)..... | --- | -8,000 | -8,000 | -8,000 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, General Activities (net)..... | --- | -1,070,000 | -1,070,000 | -1,070,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, General Services Administration (net).... | --- | -37,461,000 | -37,461,000 | -37,461,000 | --- | --- |
| National Archives and Records Administration | | | | | | |
| Operating Expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -166,000 | -166,000 | -166,000 | --- | --- |
| Office of Personnel Management | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (rescission)..... | --- | -1,161,000 | -1,161,000 | -1,161,000 | --- | --- |
| Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund..... | 40,965,000 | 40,965,000 | 40,965,000 | 40,965,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Office of Personnel Management (net).... | 40,965,000 | 39,804,000 | 39,804,000 | 39,804,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Chapter XII: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority (net)... | 76,647,000 | 198,099,000 | 221,499,000 | 222,299,000 | +24,200,000 | +800,000 |
| Appropriations..... | (76,647,000) | (246,327,000) | (269,727,000) | (270,527,000) | (+24,200,000) | (+800,000) |
| Rescissions..... | --- | (-48,228,000) | (-48,228,000) | (-48,228,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on availability of revenue)..... | (4,225,000) | (28,033,000) | (4,225,000) | (28,033,000) | --- | (+23,808,000) |
| CHAPTER XII | | | | | | |
| FEDERAL FUNDS 1/ | | | | | | |
| Criminal Justice Initiative..... | 14,180,000 | --- | 14,180,000 | 14,180,000 | +14,180,000 | --- |
| Total, Federal Funds..... | 14,180,000 | --- | 14,180,000 | 14,180,000 | +14,180,000 | --- |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS 2/ | | | | | | |
| Operating Expenses | | | | | | |
| Governmental direction and support..... | (4,553,000) | --- | (4,295,000) | (4,553,000) | (+4,553,000) | (+258,000) |
| Economic development and regulation..... | (9,873,000) | --- | (9,849,000) | (9,873,000) | (+9,873,000) | (+24,000) |
| Public safety and Justice..... | (26,680,000) | --- | (21,681,000) | (26,680,000) | (+26,680,000) | (+4,999,000) |
| (Rescission)..... | (-300,000) | --- | --- | (-300,000) | (-300,000) | (-300,000) |
| Public education system..... | (6,835,000) | --- | (5,251,000) | (6,835,000) | (+6,835,000) | (+1,584,000) |
| (Rescission)..... | (-11,794,000) | --- | (-8,500,000) | (-11,794,000) | (-11,794,000) | (-3,294,000) |
| Human support services..... | (9,598,000) | --- | (7,866,000) | (9,598,000) | (+9,598,000) | (+1,732,000) |
| Public works (rescission)..... | (-875,000) | --- | (-875,000) | (-875,000) | (-875,000) | --- |
| Washington Convention Center Fund..... | (324,000) | --- | (500,000) | (324,000) | (+324,000) | (-176,000) |
| Repayment of loans and interest (rescission)..... | (-1,473,000) | --- | (-1,473,000) | (-1,473,000) | (-1,473,000) | --- |
| Repayment of general fund deficit..... | (3,500,000) | --- | --- | (3,500,000) | (+3,500,000) | (+3,500,000) |
| Short-term borrowings (rescission)..... | (-1,250,000) | --- | (-1,250,000) | (-1,250,000) | (-1,250,000) | --- |
| Adjustments..... | (3,576,000) | --- | (3,576,000) | --- | --- | (-3,576,000) |
| Personal Services..... | --- | --- | (8,327,000) | --- | --- | (-8,327,000) |
| Total, Operating Expenses..... | (49,247,000) | --- | (49,247,000) | (45,671,000) | (+45,671,000) | (-3,576,000) |
| Capital Outlay..... | (23,400,000) | --- | (5,750,000) | (23,400,000) | (+23,400,000) | (+17,650,000) |

1/ The District communicated this request to the Committee May 28, 1985.

2/ These estimates are contained in the Mayor's May 6, 1985 request to the Council and the May 28, 1985 Communication on Federal Funds.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House Senate | |
|--|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--|------------------|
| Enterprise Funds | | | | | | |
| Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund..... | (10,801,000) | --- | (10,801,000) | (10,801,000) | (+10,801,000) | --- |
| Total, enterprise funds..... | (10,801,000) | --- | (10,801,000) | (10,801,000) | (+10,801,000) | --- |
| Total, District of Columbia funds..... | (83,448,000) | --- | (65,798,000) | (79,872,000) | (+79,872,000) | (+14,074,000) |
| Total, Chapter XII: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority (net)... | 14,180,000 | --- | 14,180,000 | 14,180,000 | +14,180,000 | --- |
| District of Columbia Funds..... | (83,448,000) | --- | (65,798,000) | (79,872,000) | (+79,872,000) | (+14,074,000) |
| Operating Expenses..... | (99,140,000) | --- | (77,896,000) | (95,564,000) | (+95,564,000) | (+17,668,000) |
| Rescissions..... | (-15,692,000) | --- | (-12,098,000) | (-15,692,000) | (-15,692,000) | (-3,594,000) |
| TITLE I - GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS | | | | | | |
| TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority (net).... | 10,428,185,436 | 11,685,724,536 | 12,594,017,536 | 11,604,382,536 | -81,342,000 | -989,635,000 |
| Appropriations..... | (10,929,329,436) | (12,465,129,536) | (13,334,835,536) | (12,317,542,536) | (-147,587,000) | (-1,017,293,000) |
| Appropriations for debt reduction..... | (-85,204,000) | (-85,204,000) | (-85,204,000) | (-85,204,000) | --- | --- |
| Authority to borrow..... | (113,000,000) | (113,000,000) | (113,000,000) | (113,000,000) | --- | --- |
| Rescissions..... | --- | (-278,261,000) | (-239,674,000) | (-212,016,000) | (+66,245,000) | (+27,638,000) |
| Rescission of contract authority..... | (-528,940,000) | (-528,940,000) | (-528,940,000) | (-528,940,000) | --- | --- |
| (Deferral disapproval)..... | --- | (1,190,175,316) | (366,572,000) | (687,446,000) | (-502,729,316) | (+320,874,000) |
| (Effect of new deferral)..... | --- | (-8,808,000) | (-5,808,000) | (-10,408,000) | (-1,600,000) | (-4,600,000) |
| (Limitation of trust fund transfer)..... | (-41,048,000) | (30,000,000) | --- | (20,000,000) | (-10,000,000) | (+20,000,000) |
| (By transfer)..... | (142,128,000) | (272,879,000) | (88,152,000) | (75,464,000) | (-197,415,000) | (-12,688,000) |
| (Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)..... | (1,219,023,979) | (1,219,023,979) | (1,219,023,979) | (1,219,023,979) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on availability of revenue)..... | (4,225,000) | (28,033,000) | (4,225,000) | (28,033,000) | --- | (+23,808,000) |
| (Change in limitation on administrative expenses)..... | (-12,274,000) | (-469,000) | (-469,000) | (-469,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on indefinite contract authority) | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | --- | --- |
| (Change in limitation on direct loans)..... | (-6,000,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Change in limitation on guaranteed loans)... | (-175,333,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on Working capital fund)..... | --- | (-30,000) | (-1,000,000) | (-1,000,000) | (-970,000) | --- |
| (District of Columbia funds net)..... | (83,448,000) | --- | (65,798,000) | (79,872,000) | (+79,872,000) | (+14,074,000) |
| TITLE II - INCREASED PAY COSTS | | | | | | |
| LEGISLATIVE BRANCH | | | | | | |
| Senate | | | | | | |
| Salaries, officers and employees..... | 4,468,000 | --- | 4,468,000 | 4,468,000 | +4,468,000 | --- |
| Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate..... | 37,000 | --- | 37,000 | 37,000 | +37,000 | --- |
| Senate policy committees..... | 50,000 | --- | 50,000 | 50,000 | +50,000 | --- |
| Total, Senate..... | 4,555,000 | --- | 4,555,000 | 4,555,000 | +4,555,000 | --- |
| House of Representatives | | | | | | |
| House leadership offices..... | 91,000 | 91,000 | 91,000 | 91,000 | --- | --- |
| Salaries, officers and employees..... | 1,176,000 | 1,176,000 | 1,176,000 | 1,176,000 | --- | --- |
| Committee employees..... | 1,012,000 | 1,012,000 | 1,012,000 | 1,012,000 | --- | --- |
| Committee on Appropriations (Studies and Investigations)..... | 16,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Members' clerk hire..... | 4,136,000 | 2,636,000 | 2,636,000 | 2,636,000 | --- | --- |
| Standing committees, special and select..... | 970,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Allowances and expenses..... | 844,000 | 669,000 | 669,000 | 669,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, House of Representatives..... | 8,245,000 | 5,584,000 | 5,584,000 | 5,584,000 | --- | --- |
| Joint Items | | | | | | |
| Joint Economic Committee..... | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | --- | --- |
| Joint Committee on Printing..... | 23,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | --- | --- |
| Capitol Guide Service..... | 20,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Joint Items..... | 118,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | --- | --- |
| Congressional Budget Office | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 245,000 | 123,000 | 123,000 | 123,000 | --- | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with House | Senate |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Architect of the Capitol | | | | | | |
| Office of the Architect of the Capitol: Salaries..... | 119,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | --- | --- |
| Capitol buildings..... | 154,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | --- | --- |
| Capitol grounds..... | 53,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | --- | --- |
| Senate office buildings..... | 260,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| House office buildings..... | 340,000 | 123,000 | 123,000 | 123,000 | --- | --- |
| Capitol power plant..... | 70,000 | 70,000 | 70,000 | 70,000 | --- | --- |
| Library buildings and grounds: Structural and mechanical care..... | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | --- | --- |
| Total: Architect of the Capitol..... | 1,086,000 | 558,000 | 558,000 | 558,000 | --- | --- |
| Library of Congress | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 2,610,000 | 1,833,000 | 1,833,000 | 1,833,000 | --- | --- |
| Copyright Office: Salaries and expenses..... | 399,000 | 199,000 | 199,000 | 199,000 | --- | --- |
| Congressional Research Service: Salaries and expenses, books for the blind and physically handicapped, Salaries and expenses..... | 917,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | --- | --- |
| Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)..... | 106,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total: Library of Congress..... | 4,043,000 | 2,532,000 | 2,532,000 | 2,532,000 | --- | --- |
| Government Printing Office | | | | | | |
| Office of Superintendent of Documents: Salaries and expenses..... | 109,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| General Accounting Office | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 5,674,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Botanic Garden | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 36,000 | 36,000 | 36,000 | 36,000 | --- | --- |
| Office of Technology Assessment | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 306,000 | 143,000 | 143,000 | 143,000 | --- | --- |
| Total: Legislative Branch..... | 24,417,000 | 9,069,000 | 13,624,000 | 13,624,000 | +4,535,000 | --- |
| THE JUDICIARY | | | | | | |
| Supreme Court of the United States | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 281,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Care of the buildings and grounds..... | 20,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total: Supreme Court of the United States..... | 301,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 87,000 | 87,000 | 87,000 | 87,000 | --- | --- |
| United States Court of International Trade | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 98,000 | 98,000 | 98,000 | 98,000 | --- | --- |
| Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and other Judicial Services | | | | | | |
| Salaries of Judges..... | 1,910,000 | 1,910,000 | 1,700,000 | 1,910,000 | --- | +210,000 |
| Salaries of supporting personnel..... | 9,150,000 | 9,150,000 | 9,150,000 | 9,150,000 | --- | --- |
| Defender services..... | 375,000 | 375,000 | 375,000 | 375,000 | --- | --- |
| Bankruptcy Courts: Salaries and expenses..... | 2,540,000 | 2,540,000 | 2,540,000 | 2,540,000 | --- | --- |
| Total: Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and other Judicial Services..... | 13,975,000 | 13,975,000 | 13,765,000 | 13,975,000 | --- | +210,000 |
| Administrative Office of the United States Courts | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 452,000 | 452,000 | 452,000 | 452,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Judicial Center | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | --- | --- |
| Total: The Judiciary..... | 15,003,000 | 14,702,000 | 14,492,000 | 14,702,000 | --- | +210,000 |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- | |
|--|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------------------------------|---------|
| | | | | | House | Senate |
| EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT | | | | | | |
| The White House Office | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 204,000 | 204,000 | 204,000 | 204,000 | --- | --- |
| Executive Residence at the White House | | | | | | |
| Operating expenses..... | 57,000 | 57,000 | 57,000 | 57,000 | --- | --- |
| Special Assistance to the President | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 13,000 | 13,000 | 13,000 | 13,000 | --- | --- |
| Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality | | | | | | |
| Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality..... | 5,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Office of Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 68,000 | 68,000 | 68,000 | 68,000 | --- | --- |
| Office of Management and Budget | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 352,000 | 352,000 | 352,000 | 352,000 | --- | --- |
| Office of Federal Procurement Policy: Salaries and expenses..... | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Office of Management and Budget..... | 367,000 | 367,000 | 367,000 | 367,000 | --- | --- |
| Office of Science and Technology Policy | | | | | | |
| Office of Science and Technology Policy..... | 20,000 | --- | 20,000 | 20,000 | +20,000 | --- |
| Total, Executive Office of the President..... | 734,000 | 709,000 | 729,000 | 729,000 | +20,000 | --- |
| DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE | | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary..... | 129,000 | 65,000 | 129,000 | 65,000 | --- | -64,000 |
| Departmental Administration..... | 300,000 | 220,000 | 300,000 | 220,000 | --- | -80,000 |
| Office of Governmental and Public Affairs..... | 62,000 | 42,000 | 62,000 | 42,000 | --- | --- |
| Office of the Inspector General (by transfer)..... | (431,000) | (431,000) | (431,000) | (431,000) | --- | --- |
| Office of the General Counsel..... | 206,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | (188,000) | (188,000) | (188,000) | --- | --- |
| Agricultural Research Service..... | --- | 4,084,000 | 4,084,000 | 4,084,000 | --- | --- |
| National Agricultural Library..... | 64,000 | 64,000 | 64,000 | 64,000 | --- | --- |
| Statistical Reporting Service: Salaries and expenses.. | 538,000 | 538,000 | 538,000 | 538,000 | --- | --- |
| Economic Research Service: Salaries and expenses..... | 489,000 | 489,000 | 489,000 | 489,000 | --- | --- |
| Agricultural Cooperative Service..... | --- | 36,000 | 36,000 | 36,000 | --- | --- |
| World Agricultural Outlook Board..... | 34,000 | 34,000 | 34,000 | 34,000 | --- | --- |
| Foreign Agricultural Service..... | 274,000 | 274,000 | 274,000 | 274,000 | --- | --- |
| General Sales Manager (transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)..... | (54,000) | (54,000) | (54,000) | (54,000) | --- | --- |
| Federal Crop Insurance Corporation | | | | | | |
| Administrative and operating expenses..... | 502,000 | 502,000 | 502,000 | 502,000 | --- | --- |
| Office of Rural Development Policy | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 18,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rural Electrification Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 324,000 | 324,000 | 324,000 | 324,000 | --- | --- |
| Farmers Home Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 8,046,000 | 8,046,000 | 8,046,000 | 8,046,000 | --- | --- |
| Soil Conservation Service | | | | | | |
| Conservation operations..... | --- | 8,196,000 | 8,196,000 | 8,196,000 | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (8,385,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| River basin surveys and investigations..... | --- | 252,000 | 252,000 | 252,000 | --- | --- |
| Watershed planning..... | --- | 172,000 | 172,000 | 172,000 | --- | --- |
| Watershed and flood prevention operations..... | --- | 1,543,000 | 1,543,000 | 1,543,000 | --- | --- |
| Resource conservation and development..... | --- | 320,000 | 320,000 | 320,000 | --- | --- |
| Great Plains conservation program..... | --- | 216,000 | 216,000 | 216,000 | --- | --- |
| Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | --- | 2,266,000 | 2,266,000 | 2,266,000 | --- | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- | |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | House | Senate |
| Federal Grain Inspection Service | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 58,000 | 58,000 | 58,000 | 58,000 | --- | --- |
| Agricultural Marketing Service | | | | | | |
| Marketing services..... | 841,000 | 841,000 | 841,000 | 841,000 | --- | --- |
| (Increase in limitation on administrative expenses)... | (753,000) | (753,000) | (753,000) | (753,000) | --- | --- |
| Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (section 32) (increase in limitation)..... | (150,000) | (150,000) | (150,000) | (150,000) | --- | --- |
| Office of transportation..... | 27,000 | 27,000 | 27,000 | 27,000 | --- | --- |
| Food Safety and Inspection Service | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 11,396,000 | 11,396,000 | 11,396,000 | 11,396,000 | --- | --- |
| Food and Nutrition Service | | | | | | |
| Food program administration..... | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Human Nutrition Information Service..... | 37,000 | 37,000 | 37,000 | 37,000 | --- | --- |
| Packers and Stockyards Administration..... | 85,000 | 85,000 | 85,000 | 85,000 | --- | --- |
| Forest Service | | | | | | |
| Forest research..... | --- | 964,000 | 1,164,000 | 1,164,000 | +200,000 | --- |
| State and private forestry..... | --- | 209,000 | 209,000 | 209,000 | --- | --- |
| National forest system..... | --- | 10,688,000 | 10,688,000 | 10,688,000 | --- | --- |
| Construction..... | --- | 1,777,000 | --- | --- | -1,777,000 | --- |
| Land acquisition..... | --- | 30,000 | --- | --- | -30,000 | --- |
| Total, Department of Agriculture..... | 24,430,000 | 54,795,000 | 53,332,000 | 53,188,000 | -1,607,000 | -144,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE | | | | | | |
| National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration | | | | | | |
| Operations, research, and facilities (by transfer).... | --- | (2,783,000) | (5,860,000) | (4,860,000) | (+2,077,000) | (-1,000,000) |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE--MILITARY | | | | | | |
| Military Personnel | | | | | | |
| Military personnel, Army..... | 483,249,000 | 442,249,000 | 417,249,000 | 417,249,000 | -25,000,000 | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | --- | (25,000,000) | (25,000,000) | (+25,000,000) | --- |
| Military personnel, Navy..... | 359,633,000 | 224,819,000 | --- | --- | -224,819,000 | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | (114,814,000) | (339,633,000) | (339,633,000) | (+224,819,000) | --- |
| Military personnel, Marine Corps..... | 116,840,000 | 116,840,000 | 106,840,000 | 106,840,000 | -10,000,000 | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | --- | (10,000,000) | (10,000,000) | (+10,000,000) | --- |
| Military personnel, Air Force..... | 417,679,000 | 275,312,000 | 224,825,000 | 254,825,000 | -20,487,000 | +30,000,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | (112,367,000) | (142,854,000) | (112,854,000) | (+487,000) | (-30,000,000) |
| Reserve personnel, Navy..... | 26,619,000 | 26,619,000 | 4,619,000 | 4,619,000 | -22,000,000 | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | --- | (22,000,000) | (22,000,000) | (+22,000,000) | --- |
| Reserve personnel, Marine Corps..... | 3,078,000 | 3,078,000 | 3,078,000 | 3,078,000 | --- | --- |
| Reserve personnel, Air Force..... | 12,776,000 | 2,976,000 | 2,976,000 | 2,976,000 | --- | --- |
| National Guard personnel, Air Force..... | 17,532,000 | 17,532,000 | 17,532,000 | 17,532,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Military Personnel..... | 1,437,406,000 | 1,109,425,000 | 777,119,000 | 807,119,000 | -302,306,000 | +30,000,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | (227,181,000) | (539,487,000) | (509,487,000) | (+282,306,000) | (-30,000,000) |
| Operation and Maintenance | | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance, Army..... | 200,400,000 | 54,470,000 | 10,466,000 | 10,466,000 | -4,004,000 | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | (+47,000,000) | (119,500,000) | (+19,300,000) | (+27,700,000) | --- |
| Operation and maintenance, Navy..... | 230,800,000 | 72,952,000 | 7,119,000 | 7,119,000 | -15,833,000 | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | (+15,148,000) | (180,855,000) | (+180,829,000) | (+45,681,000) | --- |
| Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps..... | 10,600,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | (8,480,000) | (8,480,000) | (8,480,000) | --- | --- |
| Operation and maintenance, Air Force..... | 120,300,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | (75,133,000) | (90,150,000) | (90,346,000) | (+15,196,000) | --- |
| Operation and maintenance, Defense Agencies..... | 106,530,000 | 89,230,000 | 81,200,000 | 81,230,000 | -8,000,000 | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | --- | (8,000,000) | (8,000,000) | (+8,000,000) | --- |
| Operation and maintenance, Army Reserve..... | 8,300,000 | 7,336,000 | 7,336,000 | 7,336,000 | --- | --- |
| Operation and maintenance, Navy Reserve..... | 1,600,000 | 600,000 | 1,400,000 | 1,400,000 | -1,000,000 | --- |
| Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve..... | 200,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | --- | --- |
| Operation and maintenance, Air Force Reserve..... | 8,800,000 | 7,300,000 | 7,300,000 | 7,300,000 | --- | --- |
| Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard..... | 15,000,000 | 13,194,000 | 13,194,000 | 13,194,000 | --- | --- |
| Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard..... | 18,500,000 | 15,091,000 | 15,091,000 | 15,091,000 | --- | --- |
| National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice Army..... | 14,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Operation and Maintenance..... | 721,044,000 | 170,335,000 | 143,298,000 | 143,298,000 | -27,037,000 | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | (365,769,000) | (406,963,000) | (406,963,000) | (+41,194,000) | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House Senate | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|---------------|
| Family Housing | | | | | | |
| Family housing: Army..... | 3,439,000 | --- | 1,700,000 | --- | --- | -1,700,000 |
| Family housing: Navy and Marine Corps..... | 1,493,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Family housing: Air Force..... | 1,454,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total, Family Housing..... | 6,386,000 | --- | 1,700,000 | --- | --- | -1,700,000 |
| Total, Department of Defense--Military..... | 2,164,836,000 | 1,279,760,000 | 922,117,000 | 950,417,000 | -329,343,000 | +28,300,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | (592,950,000) | (946,450,000) | (916,450,000) | (+323,500,000) | (-30,000,000) |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE--CIVIL | | | | | | |
| Cemeterial Expenses: Army | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 53,000 | 53,000 | 53,000 | 53,000 | --- | --- |
| Corps of Engineers - Civil | | | | | | |
| General investigations (by transfer)..... | (2,200,000) | (2,200,000) | (2,200,000) | (2,200,000) | --- | --- |
| General expenses (by transfer)..... | (3,000,000) | (3,000,000) | (3,000,000) | (3,000,000) | --- | --- |
| Soldiers' and Airmen's Wages | | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance..... | 324,000 | 324,000 | 324,000 | 324,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Department of Defense--Civil..... | 377,000 | 377,000 | 377,000 | 377,000 | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (5,200,000) | (5,200,000) | (5,200,000) | (5,200,000) | --- | --- |
| DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY | | | | | | |
| Energy Programs | | | | | | |
| Energy Information Administration..... | 495,000 | 495,000 | 495,000 | 495,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Energy Regulatory Commission..... | 1,627,000 | 1,627,000 | 1,627,000 | 1,627,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Department of Energy..... | 2,122,000 | 2,122,000 | 2,122,000 | 2,122,000 | --- | --- |
| DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES | | | | | | |
| Food and Drug Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | --- | 3,535,000 | 3,535,000 | 3,535,000 | --- | --- |
| Health Services Administration | | | | | | |
| Indian health services..... | --- | 9,297,000 | 4,650,000 | 7,000,000 | -2,297,000 | +2,350,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT | | | | | | |
| Management and Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (by transfer)..... | (2,712,000) | (2,712,000) | (2,712,000) | (2,712,000) | --- | --- |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR | | | | | | |
| Bureau of Land Management | | | | | | |
| Management of lands and resources..... | --- | 2,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 2,000,000 | --- | -1,000,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | (2,000,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| United States Fish and Wildlife Service | | | | | | |
| Resource management..... | --- | 2,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | +2,000,000 | --- |
| National Park Service | | | | | | |
| Operation of the national park system..... | --- | 8,700,000 | 8,700,000 | 8,700,000 | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (10,700,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement | | | | | | |
| Regulation and technology..... | --- | 455,000 | 455,000 | 455,000 | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (455,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Geological Survey | | | | | | |
| Surveys, investigations, and research..... | --- | 4,464,000 | 4,464,000 | 4,464,000 | --- | --- |
| Bureau of Indian Affairs | | | | | | |
| Operation of Indian programs..... | --- | 5,000,000 | --- | 5,000,000 | --- | +5,000,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | (5,000,000) | --- | (5,000,000) | --- | --- | (-5,000,000) |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House Senate | |
|--|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|--------------|
| Departmental Offices | | | | | | |
| Office of the Solicitor..... | --- | 306,000 | 306,000 | 306,000 | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (406,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total, Department of the Interior..... | --- | 22,925,000 | 20,925,000 | 24,925,000 | 12,000,000 | 14,000,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | (18,561,000) | --- | (5,000,000) | --- | --- | (-5,000,000) |
| DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE | | | | | | |
| General Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,068,000 | 1,068,000 | 1,068,000 | 1,068,000 | --- | --- |
| United States Parole Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 160,000 | 160,000 | 160,000 | 160,000 | --- | --- |
| Legal Activities | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses, General Legal Activities..... | 3,308,000 | 3,308,000 | 3,308,000 | 3,308,000 | --- | --- |
| Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division..... | 665,000 | 665,000 | 665,000 | 665,000 | --- | --- |
| Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals..... | 6,151,000 | 6,175,000 | 6,151,000 | 6,175,000 | --- | 124,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | (1,636,000) | (1,636,000) | (1,636,000) | (1,636,000) | --- | --- |
| Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service.... | 135,000 | 135,000 | 135,000 | 135,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Legal Activities..... | 10,259,000 | 10,283,000 | 10,259,000 | 10,283,000 | --- | 124,000 |
| Interagency Law Enforcement | | | | | | |
| Organized crime drug enforcement..... | 43,000 | 43,000 | 43,000 | 43,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Bureau of Investigation | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 15,270,000 | 15,270,000 | 15,270,000 | 15,270,000 | --- | --- |
| Drug Enforcement Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 4,682,000 | 4,682,000 | 4,682,000 | 4,682,000 | --- | --- |
| Immigration and Naturalization Service | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 9,561,000 | 9,561,000 | 9,561,000 | 9,561,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Prison System | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 7,345,000 | 7,345,000 | 7,345,000 | 7,345,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated: (Limitation on administrative and vocational training expenses). | (104,000) | (104,000) | (104,000) | (104,000) | --- | --- |
| Total, Department of Justice..... | 48,388,000 | 48,412,000 | 48,388,000 | 48,412,000 | --- | 124,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF LABOR | | | | | | |
| Labor-Management Services | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 526,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation | | | | | | |
| Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation fund (increase in limitation)..... | (244,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Employment Standards Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,819,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on trust fund transfer)..... | (5,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Black lung disability trust fund..... | 176,000 | 176,000 | 176,000 | 176,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Employment Standards Administration..... | 1,995,000 | 176,000 | 176,000 | 176,000 | --- | --- |
| Occupational Safety and Health Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,176,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Mine Safety and Health Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,435,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bureau of Labor Statistics | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 932,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- | |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | House | Senate |
| Departmental Management | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,070,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Office of the Inspector General..... | 288,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assistant Secretary for Veterans Employment and Training (limitation on trust fund transfer)..... | (143,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total, Departmental Management..... | 1,358,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total, Department of Labor..... | 7,422,000 | 176,000 | 176,000 | 176,000 | --- | --- |
| DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | | | | | | |
| Federal Highway Administration | | | | | | |
| (Limitation on general operating expenses)..... | (1,716,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| National Highway Traffic Safety Administration | | | | | | |
| Operations and research (by transfer)..... | (367,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Federal Railroad Administration | | | | | | |
| Office of the Administrator (by transfer)..... | (212,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Railroad safety (by transfer)..... | (201,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Urban Mass Transportation Administration | | | | | | |
| Administrative expenses (by transfer)..... | (609,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Federal Aviation Administration | | | | | | |
| Operations (by transfer)..... | (22,000,000) | (3,112,000) | (3,112,000) | (3,112,000) | --- | --- |
| Headquarters administration (by transfer)..... | (386,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Operation and maintenance, Metropolitan Washington Airports (by transfer)..... | (524,000) | (505,000) | (505,000) | (505,000) | --- | --- |
| Coast Guard | | | | | | |
| Operating expenses..... | --- | 15,000,000 | --- | 15,000,000 | --- | +15,000,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | (19,000,000) | (3,275,000) | (19,275,000) | (3,275,000) | --- | (-15,000,000) |
| Reserve training (by transfer)..... | (1,468,000) | (1,025,000) | (1,025,000) | (1,025,000) | --- | --- |
| Maritime Administration | | | | | | |
| Operations and training (by transfer)..... | (552,000) | (552,000) | (552,000) | (552,000) | --- | --- |
| Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation | | | | | | |
| (Limitation on administrative expenses) (increase in limitation)..... | (20,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Office of the Inspector General | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (by transfer)..... | (323,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Research and Special Programs Administration | | | | | | |
| Research and special programs (by transfer)..... | (306,000) | (300,000) | (300,000) | (300,000) | --- | --- |
| Office of the Secretary | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (by transfer)..... | (875,000) | (65,000) | (65,000) | (65,000) | --- | --- |
| Total, Department of Transportation..... | --- | 15,000,000 | --- | 15,000,000 | --- | +15,000,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | (45,823,000) | (8,834,000) | (23,834,000) | (8,834,000) | --- | (-15,000,000) |
| (Increase in limitation)..... | (20,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY | | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 657,000 | 657,000 | 657,000 | 657,000 | --- | --- |
| Office of Revenue Sharing | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 72,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Federal Law Enforcement Training Center | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 102,000 | 102,000 | 102,000 | 102,000 | --- | --- |
| Financial Management Service | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,229,000 | 1,229,000 | 1,229,000 | 1,229,000 | --- | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House Senate | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--|--------------|
| Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,339,000 | 1,339,000 | 1,339,000 | 1,339,000 | --- | --- |
| United States Customs Service | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 6,246,000 | 12,492,000 | 12,492,000 | 12,492,000 | --- | --- |
| Bureau of the Public Debt | | | | | | |
| Administering the public debt..... | 849,000 | 849,000 | 849,000 | 849,000 | --- | --- |
| Internal Revenue Service | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,500,000 | 1,821,000 | 1,821,000 | 1,821,000 | --- | --- |
| Processing tax returns..... | 4,704,000 | 14,384,000 | 14,384,000 | 14,384,000 | --- | --- |
| Examinations and appeals..... | 21,193,000 | 28,539,000 | 28,539,000 | 28,539,000 | --- | --- |
| Investigation, collection and taxpayer service..... | 4,800,000 | 20,453,000 | 20,453,000 | 20,453,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Internal Revenue Service..... | 32,197,000 | 65,197,000 | 65,197,000 | 65,197,000 | --- | --- |
| United States Secret Service | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 2,214,000 | 2,214,000 | 2,214,000 | 2,214,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Department of the Treasury..... | 44,905,000 | 84,079,000 | 84,079,000 | 84,079,000 | --- | --- |
| ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 5,423,000 | 5,423,000 | 5,423,000 | 5,423,000 | --- | --- |
| GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | |
| Federal Buildings Fund: | | | | | | |
| Limitation on availability of revenue: | | | | | | |
| Construction and acquisition of facilities.... | (-7,781,000) | --- | (-7,781,000) | --- | --- | (+7,781,000) |
| Real property operations..... | (5,682,000) | (-2,099,000) | (5,682,000) | (-2,099,000) | --- | (-7,781,000) |
| Program direction..... | (1,469,000) | (1,469,000) | (1,469,000) | (1,469,000) | --- | --- |
| Design and construction services..... | (630,000) | (630,000) | (630,000) | (630,000) | --- | --- |
| Total, Federal Buildings Fund..... | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Operating expenses, personal property (by transfer)... | (2,200,000) | (2,200,000) | (2,200,000) | (2,200,000) | --- | --- |
| General management and administration: Salaries and expenses (by transfer)..... | (2,200,000) | (2,200,000) | (2,200,000) | (2,200,000) | --- | --- |
| NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | |
| Research and program management..... | 23,300,000 | 21,300,000 | 21,300,000 | 21,300,000 | --- | --- |
| OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 917,000 | 917,000 | 917,000 | 917,000 | --- | --- |
| Salaries and expenses (increase in limitation)..... | (448,000) | (448,000) | (448,000) | (448,000) | --- | --- |
| VETERANS ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | |
| Medical care..... | 72,524,000 | 152,524,000 | 122,524,000 | 152,524,000 | --- | +30,000,000 |
| General operating expenses..... | 7,932,000 | 6,000,000 | 3,500,000 | 3,500,000 | -2,500,000 | --- |
| Construction, minor projects (limitation on administrative expenses)..... | (371,000) | --- | (371,000) | (371,000) | (+371,000) | --- |
| Total, Veterans Administration..... | 80,456,000 | 158,524,000 | 126,024,000 | 156,024,000 | -2,500,000 | +30,000,000 |
| OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| ACTION | | | | | | |
| Operating expenses..... | 233,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Administrative Conference of the United States | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | --- | --- |
| Commission of Fine Arts | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | --- | --- |
| Commission on Civil Rights | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 122,000 | 122,000 | 122,000 | 122,000 | --- | --- |
| Commodity Futures Trading Commission | | | | | | |
| Commodity Futures Trading Commission..... | 272,000 | 272,000 | 272,000 | 272,000 | --- | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House | Senate |
|---|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---|--------------|
| Equal Employment Opportunity Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 2,900,000 | 2,900,000 | 2,900,000 | 2,900,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Communications Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,830,000 | 1,830,000 | 1,830,000 | 1,830,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Election Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 116,000 | 116,000 | 116,000 | 116,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Emergency Management Agency | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (by transfer)..... | (2,472,000) | --- | (2,472,000) | --- | --- | (-2,472,000) |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board | | | | | | |
| (Limitation on non-administrative expenses, corporate funds)..... | (720,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds)..... | (1,110,000) | (1,110,000) | (1,110,000) | (1,110,000) | --- | --- |
| Federal Labor Relations Authority | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 167,000 | 167,000 | 167,000 | 167,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 234,000 | 234,000 | 234,000 | 234,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 36,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Federal Trade Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,450,000 | 1,450,000 | 1,450,000 | 1,450,000 | --- | --- |
| Intelligence Community Staff | | | | | | |
| Intelligence community staff..... | 174,000 | 174,000 | 174,000 | 174,000 | --- | --- |
| Intergovernmental Agencies | | | | | | |
| Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | --- | --- |
| Delaware River Basin Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | --- | --- |
| Susquehanna River Basin Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | --- | --- |
| International Trade Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 549,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | --- | --- |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,000,000 | 500,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | +500,000 | --- |
| Merit Systems Protection Board | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 194,000 | 194,000 | 194,000 | 194,000 | --- | --- |
| Office of the Special Counsel..... | 44,000 | 44,000 | 44,000 | 44,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Merit Systems Protection Board..... | 238,000 | 238,000 | 238,000 | 238,000 | --- | --- |
| National Capital Planning Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | --- | --- |
| National Science Foundation | | | | | | |
| Program development and management (limitation on administrative expenses)..... | (1,670,000) | (1,670,000) | (1,670,000) | (1,670,000) | --- | --- |
| United States Antarctic program activities..... | 750,000 | 750,000 | 750,000 | 750,000 | --- | --- |
| National Transportation Safety Board | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 199,000 | 199,000 | 199,000 | 199,000 | --- | --- |
| Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 18,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 | --- | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House Senate | |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|------------------|
| Securities and Exchange Commission | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,045,000 | 1,294,000 | 1,045,000 | 1,045,000 | -249,000 | --- |
| Smithsonian Institution | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,906,000 | 1,906,000 | 1,906,000 | 1,906,000 | --- | --- |
| Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art..... | 363,000 | 363,000 | 363,000 | 363,000 | --- | --- |
| Salaries and expenses, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars..... | 16,000 | 16,000 | 16,000 | 16,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Smithsonian Institution..... | 2,285,000 | 2,285,000 | 2,285,000 | 2,285,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Other Independent Agencies..... | 13,675,000 | 12,906,000 | 13,137,000 | 13,137,000 | (251,000) | --- |
| United States Holocaust Memorial Council | | | | | | |
| Holocaust Memorial Council..... | 13,000 | 13,000 | 13,000 | 13,000 | --- | --- |
| United States Tax Court | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 350,000 | 350,000 | 350,000 | 350,000 | --- | --- |
| TITLE II - INCREASED PAY COSTS | | | | | | |
| TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority..... | 2,456,768,000 | 1,744,391,000 | 1,335,730,000 | 1,415,470,000 | -328,921,000 | 129,748,000 |
| (Increase in limitations)..... | (862,000) | (598,000) | (598,000) | (598,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on administrative expenses)..... | (3,861,000) | (1,774,000) | (2,145,000) | (2,145,000) | (1,371,000) | --- |
| (Trust fund transfer)..... | (148,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (89,654,000) | (619,188,000) | (998,237,000) | (944,765,000) | (4325,577,000) | (-51,672,000) |
| TITLE I - GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS | | | | | | |
| Chapter II: | | | | | | |
| Agriculture: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | 3,436,072,000 | 4,453,126,000 | 4,464,569,000 | 3,468,772,000 | -984,356,000 | -995,797,000 |
| Appropriations..... | (3,323,072,000) | (4,340,126,000) | (4,360,772,000) | (3,357,556,000) | (-982,570,000) | (-1,003,216,000) |
| Rescissions..... | --- | --- | (-9,203,000) | (-1,784,000) | (-1,784,000) | (47,419,000) |
| Authority to borrow..... | (113,000,000) | (113,000,000) | (113,000,000) | (113,000,000) | --- | --- |
| Chapter III: | | | | | | |
| Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | 423,704,000 | 326,579,000 | 401,359,000 | 534,416,000 | 426,837,000 | 433,657,000 |
| Appropriations..... | (444,404,000) | (401,342,000) | (554,058,000) | (604,438,000) | (4203,096,000) | (450,360,000) |
| Rescissions..... | --- | (-54,063,000) | (-51,999,000) | (-49,322,000) | (44,741,000) | (42,677,000) |
| Appropriation for debt reduction..... | (-20,700,000) | (-20,700,000) | (-20,700,000) | (-20,700,000) | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (35,978,000) | (17,462,000) | (20,464,000) | (23,064,000) | (15,602,000) | (42,600,000) |
| (Limitation on direct loans)..... | (-6,000,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans)..... | (-175,333,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Deferral actions - net)..... | --- | (8,500,000) | (8,500,000) | (8,500,000) | --- | --- |
| Chapter IIII: | | | | | | |
| Defense: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | --- | --- | 74,000,000 | 35,000,000 | 435,000,000 | -39,000,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | --- | (240,000,000) | (14,000,000) | --- | (-240,000,000) | (-14,000,000) |
| Chapter IVI: | | | | | | |
| Energy and Water Development: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | --- | 113,150,000 | 62,409,000 | 111,120,000 | -2,030,000 | 48,711,000 |
| Appropriations..... | --- | (113,150,000) | (96,800,000) | (119,400,000) | (16,250,000) | (422,600,000) |
| Rescissions..... | --- | --- | (-34,391,000) | (-8,280,000) | (-8,280,000) | (426,111,000) |
| Chapter V: | | | | | | |
| Foreign Operations: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | 2,496,036,436 | 2,275,036,436 | 2,496,036,436 | 2,525,036,436 | 429,000,000 | 129,000,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | (5,686,000) | (5,686,000) | (15,343,000) | (16,100,000) | (10,414,000) | (757,000) |
| (Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)..... | (1,219,023,979) | (1,219,023,979) | (1,219,023,979) | (1,219,023,979) | --- | --- |
| Chapter VII: | | | | | | |
| Housing & Urban Development-Independent Agencies: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority (net)..... | -353,946,000 | -389,146,000 | -198,717,000 | -295,004,000 | 494,140,000 | -96,289,000 |
| Appropriations..... | (175,000,000) | (237,700,000) | (331,220,000) | (266,226,000) | (426,526,000) | (-91,000,000) |
| Rescissions..... | --- | (-99,964,000) | (-26,997,000) | (-26,284,000) | (473,629,000) | (-5,207,000) |
| Rescission of contract authority..... | (-528,940,000) | (-528,940,000) | (-528,940,000) | (-528,940,000) | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (5,771,000) | --- | (7,100,000) | (5,105,000) | (45,105,000) | (-1,995,000) |
| (Limitation on indefinite contract authority) | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | --- | --- |
| Chapter VIII: | | | | | | |
| Interior and Related Agencies: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority (net)..... | 68,841,000 | 89,155,000 | 122,493,000 | 194,433,000 | 185,278,000 | 171,940,000 |
| Appropriations..... | (68,841,000) | (146,037,000) | (181,667,000) | (251,367,000) | (4105,336,000) | (467,786,000) |
| Rescissions..... | --- | (-56,882,000) | (-59,174,000) | (-56,934,000) | (-52,000) | (12,240,000) |
| (By transfer)..... | (29,946,000) | (4,900,000) | (4,900,000) | (4,900,000) | --- | --- |
| (Deferral disapproval)..... | --- | (1,179,388,316) | (321,785,000) | (642,629,000) | (-536,729,316) | (4320,874,000) |
| (Effect of new deferral)..... | --- | (-8,808,000) | (-5,808,000) | (-10,408,000) | (-1,600,000) | (-4,600,000) |
| Chapter VIIII: | | | | | | |
| Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | 4,206,750,000 | 4,592,841,000 | 4,778,295,000 | 4,714,838,000 | 4121,997,000 | -63,457,000 |
| (By transfer)..... | (35,591,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1985 (HR 2577)

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | Conference compared with --- House Senate | |
|---|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--|------------------|
| (Limitation on administration)..... | (-12,274,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Limitation of trust fund transfer)..... | (-41,048,000) | (30,800,000) | --- | (20,000,000) | (-10,000,000) | (-20,000,000) |
| (Deferral action - net)..... | --- | --- | (4,800,000) | (4,800,000) | (4,800,000) | --- |
| Chapter IXI | | | | | | |
| Legislative Branch: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | 36,276,000 | 20,460,100 | 33,880,100 | 36,800,100 | 16,420,000 | 13,000,000 |
| Chapter XI | | | | | | |
| Transportation: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | 21,619,000 | 6,424,000 | 44,014,800 | 42,414,000 | 135,990,000 | -1,600,000 |
| Appropriations..... | (86,123,000) | (90,110,000) | (124,300,000) | (128,100,000) | (137,990,000) | (-13,900,000) |
| Rescissions..... | --- | (-19,182,000) | (-15,682,000) | (-21,182,000) | (-2,000,000) | (-3,580,000) |
| Appropriation for debt reduction..... | (-64,504,000) | (-64,504,000) | (-64,504,000) | (-64,504,000) | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (29,136,000) | (4,831,000) | (26,345,000) | (26,295,000) | (-21,444,000) | (-50,000) |
| (Change in limitation on administrative expenses)..... | --- | (-469,000) | (-469,000) | (-469,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on Working capital fund)..... | --- | (-30,000) | (-1,000,000) | (-1,000,000) | (-970,000) | --- |
| (Deferral action - net)..... | --- | --- | (30,000,000) | (30,000,000) | (130,000,000) | --- |
| Chapter XII | | | | | | |
| Treasury Postal Service & General Government: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | 76,647,000 | 198,099,000 | 221,499,000 | 222,299,000 | 124,200,000 | 1900,000 |
| Appropriations..... | (76,647,000) | (244,327,000) | (269,727,000) | (270,527,000) | (174,200,000) | (1900,000) |
| Rescissions..... | --- | (-48,228,000) | (-48,228,000) | (-48,228,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on availability of revenue)..... | (4,225,000) | (28,033,000) | (4,225,000) | (28,033,000) | --- | (123,000,000) |
| Chapter XIII | | | | | | |
| District of Columbia: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority..... | 14,180,000 | --- | 14,180,000 | 14,180,000 | 14,180,000 | --- |
| District of Columbia funds (net)..... | (83,448,000) | --- | (65,798,000) | (79,872,000) | (179,872,000) | (114,074,000) |
| Operating Expenses..... | (99,140,000) | --- | (77,896,000) | (75,564,000) | (195,564,000) | (17,668,000) |
| Rescissions..... | (-15,692,000) | --- | (-12,098,000) | (-15,692,000) | (-15,692,000) | (-3,594,000) |
| TITLE I - GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS | | | | | | |
| TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority (net)..... | 10,428,185,436 | 11,485,724,536 | 12,594,017,536 | 11,604,382,536 | -81,342,000 | -937,635,000 |
| Appropriations..... | (10,729,329,436) | (12,465,129,536) | (13,334,835,536) | (12,317,542,536) | (-147,587,000) | (-1,017,291,000) |
| Appropriations for debt reduction..... | (-85,204,000) | (-85,204,000) | (-85,204,000) | (-85,204,000) | --- | --- |
| Authority to borrow..... | (113,000,000) | (113,000,000) | (113,000,000) | (113,000,000) | --- | --- |
| Rescissions..... | --- | (-278,261,000) | (-239,674,000) | (-212,016,000) | (166,245,000) | (127,658,000) |
| Rescission of contract authority..... | (-528,940,000) | (-528,940,000) | (-528,940,000) | (-528,940,000) | --- | --- |
| (Deferral disapproval)..... | --- | (1,190,175,316) | (366,572,000) | (687,446,000) | (-502,729,316) | (1320,874,000) |
| (Effect of new deferral)..... | --- | (-8,808,000) | (-5,808,000) | (-10,408,000) | (-1,600,000) | (-4,600,000) |
| (Limitation of trust fund transfer)..... | (-41,048,000) | (30,000,000) | --- | (20,000,000) | (-10,000,000) | (120,000,000) |
| (By transfer)..... | (142,128,000) | (272,879,000) | (88,152,000) | (75,464,000) | (-177,415,000) | (-12,688,000) |
| (Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)..... | (1,219,023,979) | (1,219,023,979) | (1,219,023,979) | (1,219,023,979) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on availability of revenue)..... | (4,225,000) | (28,033,000) | (4,225,000) | (28,033,000) | --- | (123,000,000) |
| (Increase in limitation on administrative expenses)..... | (-12,274,000) | (-469,000) | (-469,000) | (-469,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on indefinite contract authority)..... | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | --- | --- |
| (Change in limitation on direct loans)..... | (-4,900,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Change in limitation on guaranteed loans)..... | (-175,333,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on Working capital fund)..... | --- | (-30,000) | (-1,000,000) | (-1,000,000) | (-970,000) | --- |
| (District of Columbia funds net)..... | (83,448,000) | --- | (65,798,000) | (79,872,000) | (179,872,000) | (114,074,000) |
| TITLE II - INCREASED PAY COSTS | | | | | | |
| TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority..... | 2,456,768,000 | 1,744,391,000 | 1,335,730,000 | 1,415,470,000 | -328,921,000 | 179,743,000 |
| (Increase in limitations)..... | (862,000) | (598,000) | (598,000) | (598,000) | --- | --- |
| (Increase in limitation on administrative expenses)..... | (3,861,000) | (1,774,000) | (2,145,000) | (2,145,000) | (1371,000) | --- |
| (Trust fund transfer)..... | (148,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (By transfer)..... | (89,654,000) | (619,188,000) | (998,237,000) | (944,765,000) | (1325,577,000) | (-53,472,000) |
| GRAND TOTAL | | | | | | |
| TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority (net)..... | 12,884,953,436 | 13,430,115,536 | 13,929,747,536 | 13,019,852,536 | -410,263,000 | -909,895,000 |
| Appropriations..... | (13,386,097,436) | (14,209,520,536) | (14,670,565,536) | (13,733,012,536) | (-476,509,000) | (-1,937,553,000) |
| Appropriations for debt reduction..... | (-85,204,000) | (-85,204,000) | (-85,204,000) | (-85,204,000) | --- | --- |
| Authority to borrow..... | (113,000,000) | (113,000,000) | (113,000,000) | (113,000,000) | --- | --- |
| Rescissions..... | --- | (-278,261,000) | (-239,674,000) | (-212,016,000) | (166,245,000) | (127,658,000) |
| Rescission of contract authority..... | (-528,940,000) | (-528,940,000) | (-528,940,000) | (-528,940,000) | --- | --- |
| (Deferral disapproval)..... | --- | (1,190,175,316) | (366,572,000) | (687,446,000) | (-502,729,316) | (1320,874,000) |
| (Effect of new deferral)..... | --- | (-8,808,000) | (-5,808,000) | (-10,408,000) | (-1,600,000) | (-4,600,000) |
| (By transfer)..... | (231,782,000) | (892,057,000) | (1,086,387,000) | (1,020,229,000) | (1128,162,000) | (-66,160,000) |
| (Increase in limitations)..... | (862,000) | (598,000) | (598,000) | (598,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)..... | (1,219,023,979) | (1,219,023,979) | (1,219,023,979) | (1,219,023,979) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on availability of revenue)..... | (4,225,000) | (28,033,000) | (4,225,000) | (28,033,000) | --- | (123,000,000) |
| (Change in limitation on administrative expenses)..... | (-8,413,000) | (1,305,000) | (1,676,000) | (1,676,000) | (1371,000) | --- |
| (Limitation on indefinite contract authority)..... | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | (-23,367,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation of trust fund transfer)..... | (-40,900,000) | (30,000,000) | --- | (20,000,000) | (-10,900,000) | (120,000,000) |
| (Change in limitation on direct loans)..... | (-4,000,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Change in limitation on guaranteed loans)..... | (-175,333,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on Working capital fund)..... | --- | (-30,000) | (-1,000,000) | (-1,000,000) | (-970,000) | --- |
| (District of Columbia funds net)..... | (83,448,000) | --- | (65,798,000) | (79,872,000) | (179,872,000) | (114,074,000) |

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the 20 authorized projects included in the water resources supplemental appropriations bill is near and dear to my heart—namely that of deepening the main ship channel leading into the Port of Baltimore which project was authorized 15 years ago in 1970.

I wish to take this time to commend the work of Chairman WHITTEN and Mr. BEVILL of the Appropriations Committee, Chairman HOWARD of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, Chairman ROE and Mr. STANGELAND of the Subcommittee on Water Resources in their contribution to the passage of the water resources supplemental appropriations bill. Their efforts are most appreciated in resolving the difficult problem of funding both authorized and unauthorized water projects.

In my home State of Maryland, the Port of Baltimore which is an authorized water project is close to having all the preliminary work necessary completed before actual port development begins. The State of Maryland is prepared to meet the Federal Government's cost-sharing formula and proceed with dredging in the Chesapeake Bay. The State has conducted a study of its own in order to reduce the overall cost of the project by more than \$110 million by narrowing the width of the 50-foot channel. Maryland has indicated it will sell its World Trade Building and issue bonds to provide the funds for its share of the costs prior to the 50-foot channel. The sum of \$53 million already has been invested by Maryland to build up Hart Miller Island as a disposal site for anticipated dredging sludge.

The entire Maryland delegation has been working to bring this about and is behind it all the way. After the dredging, larger ships will be free to enter the Baltimore Port. Greater means for trade will create more jobs and a stronger economy with the importation and exportation of goods. The steel industry will greatly benefit from an increase of maritime trade.

The Baltimore ship channel is also vital to providing the measure for the United States to improve its exports—of coal and grain—and thus keep our balance of trade. It is a project also equally important to keeping a steel mill alive—by allowing deeper draft ships—more heavily laden with iron ore to call on our steel mill—and therefore providing cheaper steel.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my praise in the action by this Congress in working to bring about new water construction projects that have been in the waiting for over a decade. Our water resource infrastructure needs such as inland waterways and port development have managed to continue to contribute to this Nation's economic development over this past 10 years without necessary fund-

ing. However, today with the decision of both the House and Senate to reach an agreement on the House/Senate conference report of the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1985 on the funding of water construction projects, we can rest assured that necessary investments will be provided to our Nation's water projects. We can expect greater economic growth resulting from today's action by this Congress.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENSE-OF-CONGRESS RESOLUTION ON SETTLEMENT OF SCHEDULED BASEBALL STRIKE

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 252) to urge negotiators for major league baseball owners and players to quickly settle their differences and avoid a scheduled players' strike, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 252

Whereas baseball is America's national pastime;

Whereas major league baseball is an important source of family-oriented entertainment for millions of Americans;

Whereas major league baseball teams are a source of local pride for fans in communities across the Nation, as well as providers of substantial revenues and employment opportunities in related businesses.

Whereas the Major League Baseball Players Association has voted to strike on Tuesday, August 6, 1985, unless they have reached a new collective-bargaining agreement with team owners by then;

Whereas a prolonged players' strike would result in the cancellation of hundreds of baseball games, the loss of millions of dollars to related businesses, and endanger the long-term interests of the sport; and

Whereas those who would suffer greatest during a baseball players' strike would be the fans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House that the Major League Baseball Players Association and team owners have a responsibility to the baseball fans of America to ensure that the current season is not interrupted, and that the parties and the Commissioner of Baseball should do everything in their power to avoid a strike by players.

Mr. CHAPPELL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] and myself which touches the question of the proposed strike or planned strike of August 6, 1985, by the Major League Baseball Players' Association if they have not by that time reached a collective-bargaining agreement with the team owners.

It simply provides that it is the sense of the House that the Major League Baseball Players' Association and team owners have a responsibility to the baseball fans of America to ensure that the current season is not interrupted and that all the parties, including the Commissioner of Baseball, should do everything in their power to avoid a strike by players.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its passage.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution introduced by my good friend BILL CHAPPELL, the Democratic baseball coach, and myself.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution urges those individuals negotiating a contract for major league baseball players and league owners to come to a speedy settlement on the differences facing them. A prompt resolution of the problems will avoid a baseball strike—which no one, I think, wants to see.

Baseball is America's pastime. It is America's sport. The fans in this country have great pride in their State's or community's baseball teams, and they do not want to see a strike. A baseball team produces millions of dollars in revenue to local communities. They provide jobs to small businesses and, as I said, are a great source of pride to their host cities.

The Major League Baseball Players' Association has voted to strike on August 6—less than 1 week from now—unless they reach a new collective-bargaining agreement with team owners. We do not want to see this happen. It would result in the cancellation of games; a prolonged strike could postpone the World Series—and since at least some of those seven games will hopefully be played in Boston this year, where it can snow very early, I certainly don't want to see a World Series being played on Thanksgiving.

Thus, I would urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and send a message to the baseball players, management, and league owners that the Congress urges a speedy settlement to the differences separating them. The resolution doesn't take sides; it merely

urges everyone involved to recognize their responsibility to the baseball fans of America and the host cities of America's major league baseball teams. We don't want a strike. We want the problems resolved as soon as possible, fairly, for all sides.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT TO ACCOMPANY HOUSE REPORT 99-230 ACCOMPANYING H.R. 1, HOUSING ACT OF 1985

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs may be permitted to file a supplemental report to accompany House Report 99-230, the report to accompany H.R. 1, the Housing Act of 1985.

The committee inadvertently excluded the explanation of title V of H.R. 1 from the committee report that was filed on July 26, 1985. This supplemental report would represent the committee's explanation of title V of the committee reported bill, H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I have checked with the minority, and they are in agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1600

MAKING IN ORDER ON THIS LEGISLATIVE DAY CONSIDERATION OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 32, FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1986

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if the Committee on Rules reports a special order providing for the consideration of the conference report and any amendment in disagreement on Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, it shall be in order to consider the same on this legislative day notwithstanding the provisions of clause 4(b) of rule XI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3008, FEDERAL EQUITABLE PAY PRACTICES ACT OF 1985

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 241 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 241

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3008) to promote equitable pay practices and to eliminate discrimination within the Federal civil service, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI and section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived, and all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5(a) of rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule, and each section shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 241 is an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The rule further provides that the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and that each section of the legislation shall be considered as having been read.

All points of order against consideration of the legislation for failure to comply with clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI, that is the 3-day layover rule for committee reports, are waived. Although the Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered the bill reported on July 24, 1985, the report was not actually filed until July 29th. Since the printed copy of the report has not been available to Members for the required 3 days, a waiver of clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI is necessary.

All points of order against consideration of the bill for failing to comply with section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act are also waived. Section 402(a) provides that it shall not be in order to consider any bill which authorizes the enactment of new budget authority for a fiscal year unless that bill has been reported on or before

May 15 preceding the beginning of such fiscal year.

H.R. 3008 indirectly authorizes the enactment of new budget authority. Since the bill will become effective upon enactment, that is in fiscal year 1985, and since it was not reported on or before May 15, 1984, a waiver of section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act is needed.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also waives clause 5(a) of rule XXI against consideration of the bill. Clause 5(a) of rule XXI prohibits appropriations in a legislative bill.

Section 9 of H.R. 3008 provides that funds appropriated to the Office of Personnel Management for general operating expenses be made available to carry out this act. This provision allows previously appropriated funds to be used for new activities and thus, constitutes an appropriation. Since H.R. 3008 is not an appropriations measure, a waiver of clause 5(a) of rule XXI is needed.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3008 established an 11 member "Commission on Equitable Pay Practices". The commission will be responsible for hiring a consultant and overseeing its study of the Federal pay and classification systems. The study, which will last no longer than 18 months, will determine if and to what extent, a Federal employee's classification and wages are affected by sex, race and ethnicity. After the study is completed, the commission will present its findings, conclusions and recommendations regarding administrative and legislative remedies to the President and Congress.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 20 years, Congress has taken great strides to ensure that all of our citizens have equal rights under the law. The Education Amendments of 1972; the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 are all measures which Congress enacted to ensure that no citizen be denied rights because of race, ethnicity or sex.

We have accomplished a great deal in this body and the other body but when a woman earns 62.8 cents for every dollar that a man earns, it is clear that inequality still exists. Mr. Speaker, this injustice must be eradicated in order that this country realize equality. H.R. 3008 will bring us one step closer to our realization.

I urge that we adopt the rule so that the House can proceed to consideration of this important measure.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, why would anyone want to oppose a simple little 1-hour, open rule providing for the consideration of an innocuous sounding bill called the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act? Surely we are all for open rules and equitable pay practices.

But in this case there's more involved than meets the eye. If there weren't, the proponents of this legislation wouldn't mind if the House followed its normal rules and took the time to at least read the report on this bill. But no, this rule waives the 3-day report availability requirement meaning that many Members will have no idea what's in the bill or what they are voting on. Ignorance may be bliss for some, but when it comes to legislative, it's inexcusable.

Why then is there such a big rush to pass this bill prior to the August recess? Is this a necessary authorization that must be enacted before the new fiscal year? No. And yet, many other must authorization bills continue to languish in our Rules Committee while we merrily put the appropriations cart before the authorization horse. And now, to add insult to injury, we inject a \$2 million study commission bill.

Is this a special emergency situation that cries out for an immediate Federal response? No. This isn't a disaster relief bill. It's a big buck consultant relief bill that will take anywhere from 18 months to 2 years to complete. There's no rush to start this compared to our more urgent budgetary situation and our must authorization bills. The fact is, I heard nothing during our Rules Committee hearing on this to even hint that this involved an emergency situation that might justify waiving our 3-day rule. This is not something we should do lightly if we value our brains.

So what's the rush? One witness, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], pointed out that there is a court decision expected in August in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals that will have an important bearing on this issue. Could it be that the proponents fear that decision could undermine this legislation? At the very least, couldn't our action on this wait until September when we can make a more informed judgment on the basis of that decision? What's the rush?

But then I began to take a closer look at this fine-sounding bill, and it slowly dawned on me why someone would want to rush this through. On the one hand we are told this is going to be a bipartisan, balanced, and objective Commission. But, when you look at this bill you find the deck is stacked: 4 employee organization representatives of labor, women, and minorities, plus 2 democratic appointees; that's 6 of the 11 members, a clear quorum and voting majority.

We are told that it is important that no member appointed to the Commission is currently employed by the Government either as a careerist or political appointee, "in order to promote objectivity and to allow the Commission to function independently of any policy or program of any administration." And yet the bill turns around and places on the Commission the "highest elected officials of the two largest Federal employee unions," and one representative each from Federal women's and minority employee organizations. Is it expected that these Commissioners will promote objectivity or will not promote the policies and programs of the organizations they represent and are paid by?

We are told that this bill only authorizes a little study by a consultant

to be hired by the Commission. And yet the bill turns around and gives the Commission authority to determine which differentials in the study are discriminatory and to recommend any administrative as well as legislative actions. We are giving the Commission quasi-judicial authority to both determine which differentials are discriminatory and how they may be remedied by administrative action. This comes close to the kind of authority which currently resides in the EEOC and Civil Rights Commission. So it's more than just a little study.

We were told, however, by the chief sponsor of this bill in her testimony before the Rules Committee, that this neither establishes a national pay policy, nor prescribes any specific remedies; it only "reaffirms the principles outlined in our civil rights laws which prohibit discrimination" in setting pay for Federal workers. And yet, the bill in section 6 only says that it "shall not be construed to limit any of the rights or remedies" provided under the Civil Rights Act and other antidiscrimination laws. It says nothing about not expanding those rights and remedies. And that's because this new theory of comparable worth would do just that—establish new rights and remedies.

I would think we would give serious and second thoughts to a study which could be used in a court of law to prove that a certain pay system or job classification system is inherently discriminatory because a certain sex, ethnic group, or minority group is disproportionately represented. And yet that prospect is not farfetched. That's what the Washington case was about as I understand it.

Mr. Speaker, we made a simple little attempt in the Rules Committee to bring Congress and the judicial branch under existing law—title VII of the Civil Rights Act which prohibits everyone else from discriminating. The amendment was proposed by the gentlelady from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN]. And yet it was turned back on a party-line vote. How is it that we are so ready to tell the rest of government that it might have discriminatory job or pay systems under a new comparable worth theory, when we aren't yet willing to bring ourselves under existing civil rights laws? When you can justify that one for me I'll vote for this rule. In the meantime, I won't.

□ 1610

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TAYLOR], a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 241 is the rule under which the House is being asked to consider one of the most controversial issues I have seen in my 13 years of membership here in

this body, whether we will have a comparable worth study of Federal civil service jobs.

I join my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], in urging the defeat of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, this rule waives one of the primary rules of the House, the rule requiring reported bills and committee reports to be available for 3 days before the bill can be called to the floor for consideration.

This rule should be rejected because it is unfair to the Members of this House. This rule attempts to short circuit the legislative process. This rule tosses aside the rules of the House, in order to make it possible to ramrod the bill through the House as quickly as possible, without adequate time to fully explore and resolve the issues presented in this legislation.

This rule asks the House to rush to judgment, 1 day before we are scheduled to adjourn for our district work period, on a very controversial and a very complex bill, the so-called Federal equitable pay practices legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the committee report has not been available for the required 3 days. It has only been available since about 1 p.m. today. That is simply not enough time. It is simply not fair to the Members of the House to force hasty consideration on this bill.

The Members of the House deserve an opportunity to examine the legislation, to read the committee report, to prepare questions for debate and to prepare amendments.

This rule does not give them enough time to do that, so from that standpoint it is procedurally unfair.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members are upset because the Rules Committee granted this waiver, they should also be concerned about the speed with which this legislation was handled in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It may not be a new legislative record, but it sure was quick.

The bill was introduced on July 16, and here we are today on the floor of the House 2 weeks later. During the time I have been privileged to serve as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I cannot recall our acting that fast on any other piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the issues involved in this legislation are highly controversial, and because we are on the verge of taking them up with such haste, there is a genuine concern that the House will be acting in a rash or careless manner.

My good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR], is quite sincere in her belief that this study of pay differentials called for in the bill is merely an effort to determine whether we have discrimination based upon sex or upon race or in regard to the setting of pay rates.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the gentleman from Ohio for her determination and I have no reservations about her intentions. When one looks at the criteria contained in the bill, however, one sees that it is based on the notion that Federal civil service jobs have a measurable, economic worth which can be determined logically and compared objectively to other and different jobs.

This is an ill-conceived notion, because Federal civil service jobs do not have a measurable, economic worth, and they cannot be compared objectively to each other. The study is, therefore, dedicated to doing something which in my judgment, is impossible.

Mr. Speaker, the theory that underlies this bill is often referred to as the comparable worth theory, which holds that jobs have intrinsic, measurable values, and dictates that salaries be based on those determined values.

□ 1620

One of the most controversial aspects of the bill is that it embraces the proposition that differences in income between men and women and the concentration of women in certain occupations are proof of discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, equal opportunity is the law of this land, and one that we all embrace. Equal pay for equal work is the law. But comparable worth is not the law, at least not yet.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that every agency of the Federal Government has an equal opportunity division within it to see to it that the laws of our land are obeyed, to see to it that we do not have discrimination in pay rates based upon sex or race. I think it works quite well. The avenues for redress of grievances are open to all Federal employees and welcome and should be.

But this bill does not address those issues of equal opportunity.

Since the bill appears to define discrimination on the basis of the comparative value of different jobs, it does present a significant departure from the clear standard of the Equal Pay Act. I do not see how we can have equal pay for equal work, which is the law, and also have equal pay for unequal work.

Because the bill calls for a commission to determine the existence of discrimination on the basis of the comparative value of different jobs, the bill gives rise to substantial concern, not only in the civil service, but also in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, these are uncharted waters. This is a whole new area. The whole area is a prescription for confusion, confrontation, dissension, and litigation, and probably a great deal of indigestion. Since there are a great number of amendments that have already been placed in the RECORD, I do

not think it is time at this late hour, as we prepare to adjourn, to consider this controversial piece of legislation, and I would urge the defeat of this rule and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER].

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to H.R. 3008 as reported by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3008 has been cloaked as a mere study. However, as drafted, H.R. 3008 would radically change existing antidiscrimination laws by sanctioning a commission to conduct a study which recognizes a presumption of discrimination when job evaluations cannot explain every detail in the wage gap.

As reported, H.R. 3008 would:

First, trigger expensive litigation if wage adjustments were not made pursuant to this study. The State of Washington, for instance, may be liable for hundreds of millions of dollars as a result of its comparable worth study;

Second, set a dangerous precedent for private sector employers; and

Third, provide a congressional endorsement of the fundamentally flawed concept of comparable worth.

Although H.R. 3008 defines job evaluation techniques as objective, job evaluations are inherently subjective. For example, comparable worth job evaluators rated a nurse to be worth 150 points in Wisconsin; 124 points in Iowa; 79 points in Minnesota and 108 points in Washington.

It's interesting to note that unions are some of the strongest supporters of comparable worth to end the wage gap. These unions are the same entities who negotiated the current contracts which they now claim are low. These are the same unions that negotiated the various contracts in industries dominated by male workers that have high wages. These are the same unions that have kept and still keep women from apprenticeship in various trades and industries. They come to this issue with unclean hands.

Apart from the economic issues, the legal precedent H.R. 3008 would establish is far-reaching. With the exception of AFSCME versus State of Washington which is on appeal, the courts have unanimously refused to accept job evaluation studies. In *American Nurses Association v. Illinois*, 606 F. Supp. 1313 Judge Kocoras stated "because jobs do not have an intrinsic value that can be scientifically measured, the limitations inherent in job evaluation techniques prohibit the proposed extension of title VII. This conclusion would be significantly weakened.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 3008 and I insert in the RECORD a document entitled "a legal analysis of H.R. 3008" and a letter to the editor.

A LEGAL ANALYSIS OF H.R. 3008 as Reported

On July 24, H.R. 3008 was reported out of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee with a committee amendment.

The amendment changes language in the bill regarding a presumption that discrimination is the cause of otherwise unexplained wage differentials in the Federal workforce between predominantly men's and women's jobs or jobs disproportionately represented in terms of race or ethnicity (defined as being of Hispanic origin). Instead of asserting that discrimination is the cause of the wage differentials left unexplained by job-content economic analyses, the amendment states that discrimination may be the cause, and assigns this determination of causality to a commission that H.R. 3008 would establish.

The claim is made that the committee amendment renders an exceedingly bad bill relatively innocuous and, therefore, supportable by opponents of comparable worth. The argument behind this claim is that the amendment removes from the bill the conclusion that, as a matter of law, any unexplained wage differentials arrived at by the studies mandated by the bill are the result of discrimination. The Myers amendment, the argument goes, at least raises the possibility that the commission may decide that discrimination does not account for these unexplained wage differentials or that it only explains a portion of them.

The amendment does not ameliorate any of the problems that we previously objected to in this bill, however. To begin with, it makes no sense to delegate to a politicized commission the responsibility to determine what, if any, portion of the unexplained wage differentials is attributable to discrimination, particularly in view of the composition of the commission as structured under H.R. 3008, which favors proponents of comparable worth.

Second, the amendment preserves the earlier expectation that the methods the bill specifies for identifying discrimination, job-content and economic analyses, can in fact do so with any precision. It would be a complete misuse of these methods to identify discrimination with the wage differentials, or any part of them, which these methods leave unexplained. Job evaluation is inherently subjective. The results of this analysis will not be bias free, but will instead reflect the opinions of the commission and the consultants chosen to execute the study.

Moreover, economic analysis is not a precise science. It can arrive at varied results through different methodologies, the choice of different variables, or the omission of other variables, some of which are simply not measurable. If variables are chosen for study that do not explain pay differentials as fully as variables that were not used, then the unexplained differential—a differential likely to be labelled a result of discrimination—will be greater. There are legitimate differences of opinion among researchers regarding the importance of different variables, and analysts arrive at extremely different conclusions with respect to the portion of wage differentials which cannot be explained.

Finally, it must be pointed out that the Committee amendment does not change the irrebuttable presumption of discrimination under H.R. 3008. Once the commission has

concluded that differentials are the result of discrimination, its determination must be accepted as final, and the government would be unable thereafter to rebut charges of discrimination by plaintiffs seeking implementation of the comparable worth study results. Such a presumption well may be extended to private employers that are contractors for the government through the auspices of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance.

The more far-reaching effect of H.R. 3008 on private sector cases is not addressed by the committee amendment. With the exception of the district court judge in *AFSCME v. State of Washington*, 578 F. Supp. 846 (D. Wash. 1983), currently on appeal, courts have refused unanimously to accept job evaluation studies as evidence of discrimination in Title VII cases. With the passage of H.R. 3008, a bill that explicitly claims to carry out the intent of Title VII, it will be difficult for defendants in Title VII cases to rebut charges of discrimination based on job evaluation studies. The conclusion of Judge Kocoras in *American Nurses' Association v. State of Illinois*, 606 F. Supp. 1313 (N.D. Ill. 1985), that "because jobs do not have an intrinsic value that can be scientifically measured, the limitations inherent in job evaluation techniques prohibit the proposed extension of Title VII" would be weakened significantly. Future plaintiffs filing Title VII suits against private employers would be able to make a strong argument that the results of job evaluation studies can suffice to prove discrimination on the basis of race, sex or ethnicity.

[From The Sounder, July 25, 1985]

COMPARABLE WORTH RAPPED

TO THE SOUNDER: The July 18th issue of The Sounder had a letter from a Madison special interest group praising the legislature and Gov. Earl for the budget passed and comparable worth.

Praise should go to those legislators that represent this area that voted no on the budget which included comparable worth.

An 18 per cent increase is a slap in the face to the residents of this state. The big spenders should be told where the door is.

Comparable worth is the most ridiculous idea to be jammed down our throats since raising the sales tax 1 per cent to relieve property taxes and then not applying it to property tax relief.

Comparable worth should not be called pay equity, but what it really is: equal pay for unequal work. This is an experiment that Wisconsin taxpayers are going to pay a lot of money for. The money will be mostly spent administering a program that directly conflicts with free enterprise and the law of supply and demand. Actually, it is perfect for creating a larger governmental bureaucracy.

The letter in The Sounder referred to business supporting pay equity. Sure business supports pay equity under a different definition. I would interpret and I'm sure the survey respondents did also assume pay based on equal would mean pay based on equal pay for equal work. Comparable worth tries to compare on a subjective basis one job with another job—and has little or no business support anywhere in the free world.

When are the people of the State of Wisconsin going to wake up and get rid of the element here that comes up with experiments like comparable worth? Are we that financially sound in this state to undertake

such a project? I hardly think so and our governor should know that too!

Sincerely,

JAMES H. HEINZELMAN,
3526 W. Fredonia-Kohler Rd.,
Fredonia, WI 53021.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Mississippi for yielding this 5 minutes. I take this time in the rule to speak for the rule and for the bill because I have been told that even though I am the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee that reported this bill that I shall not control the time today. So I take this time today on this rule to say I support the rule and I support the bill.

For my support I have received some criticism from some in this body and from some throughout the country because I am a conservative. I am not supposed to be for new ideas, I guess, or fairness. And I am sorry about some of the statements that have been made and will be made, and probably some of the distortions that may be made about what is in this bill.

I commend our chairman, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR]. I have found her to be most cooperative on some of the differences we have had on my side, the Republican side, where there were many serious disagreements. I had some disagreements with H.R. 27, but our chair was most cooperative. Not completely, this is not exactly the bill that I would like to see. There are still some questions about this bill, and there may be some amendments that I may support that come along. But in the whole, in the main, I do support the thrust of this bill.

I thank our chair for being cooperative to even changing the bill number by reintroducing the bill to satisfy the wishes and the questions that the minority raised, the Republicans on the committee. She changed the composition of the committee to make it more bipartisan, more equitable in the commission because there were serious questions, rightfully so, about the composition, being slanted. It may be slanted one way or the other right now. But at least it is much more fair than it was originally.

The authority in section 7 is where I had the most disagreement which does spell out the job to be done by the commission, and by the consultant that will be hired by the commission. There was a presumption of guilt that was written into H.R. 27, and originally into H.R. 3008, the bill we have here. But the chair and the majority, even though they had the votes to push their bill if they wanted to, they did cooperate in softening the language. This is language that was changed in the full committee. It is on page 12 of the bill and it is lined out.

It says:

Any portion of a differential identified under paragraph (1) which cannot be accounted for by the application of job content and economic analysis is inconsistent with the general policy expressed in section 2(a) that sex, race, and ethnicity should not be among the factors considered in determining any rate of pay.

This, in the judgment of some of us, would trigger and would cause reason for some unnecessary lawsuits. That was changed and that language was struck and a softer approach was taken, through the insistence of some of us in the minority. It is not completely satisfactory in the entire section, and there are some questions in my mind. But some of these things will come up on debate, I am sure, and we will clarify what the intent is here.

But no one can disagree that we have not already, through our hearings and through the mail we have received, we know that there are reported some irregularities, some statistical differences in pay between men and women employed by the Federal Government. We do not know why this is so, and that is the purpose of this study.

□ 1630

But those who say we give extra judicial authority to the commission or the consultant, that is not in today's bill. I do not think they have read the bill we have today. There is a pay gap, we all recognize this.

As a parent of two children who happen to have been born female, through no fault of theirs or mine, I guess, that I know about, I think they should be paid just as much for the same work as if they had been born male. Now I cannot say that my children or yours or your wife or your sister or your aunt, mother, grandmother should be paid less because they were born female and are willing to work for less. This is a study to see if that really occurs in the Federal Government. It does not touch anybody outside the Federal Government. I do not understand the fear that some people have.

But nevertheless, this is just a study.

The cost, some will object to, there is going to be no cost to the Federal Government as far as forcing a pay increase that we know of unless they are already paying Federal employees who happen to be females less.

It is going to cost something for the study, but I think it is a fair one and I support it.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to support the rule but I especially want to thank the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. MYERS of In-

diana, for the magnificent cooperation he has given me. I want to say that we have had hearings for 4 years on the spirit of the bill, which was begun by Congresswomen SCHROEDER, Ms. Ferraro, and myself as three subcommittee chairs. In this year alone we had more than 55 witnesses, both pro and con. We were very happy to accommodate the minority in letting the individuals they wished to testify.

It has been an absolute pleasure to work with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. It is true that one of the reasons I reintroduced the bill with 102 cosponsors on both sides of the aisle is because I wanted to show that the issues that some of the witnesses brought up were considered. We could accommodate those things. Last year our bill which passed the House approved 413 to 6 in the last session, we had the study based on job content alone. This is the type of study that is being used all over the country—and there are some 45 of them.

They only require really job content. GAO and the gentleman from Indiana and a number of individuals who testified said: "Well, what about the marketplace?" In evaluating, we felt that that was fair. We do not say in any way, shape or form that this disparity between a man's wage and a woman's wage is necessarily discrimination.

What we are saying is, do a study and evaluate the job content and look at the market factors. We added the market factor issue in, in the spirit of cooperation with the gentleman from Indiana and some of his witnesses because we were attempting to be totally objective about this.

The gentleman from Indiana pointed out that he thought the composition of the commission ought to be more bipartisan. We did add that. In all honesty, I have questions about who the President might appoint or who OPM might appoint. But we added that section and it is much more in line with what the Senate is doing. What Senator EVANS, a very fine Republican, and Senator CRANSTON introduced—a similar bill.

The other question that came up time and time again was the question of race, minorities and Hispanics? It seemed as if the classification system did in fact have minorities, as well as women, at the bottom of the barrel. We added race and ethnicity to take care of them.

But the gentleman is absolutely correct when he says that we have really tried to accommodate the spirit of a bipartisan bill. I for one want to applaud the gentleman from Indiana for all of his work. He was at every single hearing. He was the first minority member I have seen while I have chaired a committee who has always been at every meeting. He is also on a very important committee, the Com-

mittee on Appropriations. Yet he always took the time to be there to hear all of the witnesses, pro and con.

So I simply want to say that I know how difficult it is when you are in a situation where many people, who are often supporters of yours, are really trying to get you to be motivated to change your mind. We all undergo those pressures. That is nothing new, that is part of the American way. I know the gentleman from Indiana has really gotten it from all sides. I appreciate that. I want him to know publicly how deeply moved I am by the fact that he would take the floor during the rule, since he apparently cannot get time as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, in the general debate which is somewhat unusual. I would be delighted to give the gentleman time from my side if he wants it. I want to thank him for all his work irrespective of how he votes. He has been a gentleman, he has been an absolute man in terms of being the ranking member of that committee and I look forward to working with him closely in the future. I want to thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. For a response, would the gentleman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. We have certain buzz words that have been used frequently on this bill. "Comparable worth" has been used to describe this bill. Again because some of us objected to the way comparable worth, how do you relate one job to another and say they are comparable when they are entirely different? But the chair took that out and we thank you for it.

Ms. OAKAR. As the gentleman knows, that is one of the problems with the Civil Rights Commission's definition. The Commission claimed comparable worth was the disparity between the man's wage and the woman's wage. Nobody is, not even the most ardent advocate of pay equity, agrees with that definition. We do not agree with that definition. So what we do is we take all of the language related to comparable worth because we have not examined the classification system of Federal employees, that is the GS-1 through GS-18 system, since 1923. What we are asking for is a study on how we classify our Federal employees, no more, no less. Comparable worth, that language is not in the bill.

I appreciate the gentleman's raising that because people want to use that code word and I frankly reject the definition of the Civil Rights Commission myself. So I thank the gentleman.

□ 1640

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN].

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, first of all, my thanks to the gentleman from Louisiana for his kind words in his speech. I come here in a rather odd situation; I do not oppose the concept or idea of reexamining a system, because for many reasons the Congress to some degree is in a management position and can dictate and direct and should direct looking at how people, regardless of color or sex or age are paid; Congress must make sure that those classifications reflect not only a market, but reflect the spirit of fairness and equity that Congress should want as an example to the people.

There have been a few mistakes made in speeches when we suggest that the Congress, who has passed other laws that now wishes to take this additional step is somehow incredibly virtuous for doing so.

The reason that Congress cannot claim unsullied purity is because the Congress had not got itself under the same scrutiny that it has imposed on others.

I am here because I find it offensive to not be able to amend this bill so that the Congress of the United States would not have to be examined; would have to agree to civil rights for its employees.

This afternoon, many of us voted in favor of a stance speaking about 16 million people in South Africa who are held under a dreadful system called apartheid.

Many of us now are going to support examining the Federal pay system on the Executive level. But when it comes time to look at ourselves, it is amazing how quickly we run away.

The gentleman from Louisiana mentioned; I was there last year, and the year before. We are all, when we look at any bill, looking at a kind of Rorschach test, and we bring to it our own experience.

One of the reasons to have a broad representation in the Congress of the United States is to get that broad range of experience. Just as no white Member can become black, just as no Anglo Member can say they understand totally the Hispanic, can any of the gentlemen here understand what it is like to hear again and again that there is no discrimination against women in the overwhelmingly male Congress of the United States. Then because men say there is none, the Congress can avoid the law of the land.

I say to the gentleman Members of this Congress on both sides of the aisle, it is wrong to impose on others rules that one does not first impose on oneself, and to deny civil rights and to deny our own employees what other employees in business, State, local, every other governmental unit have, is wrong.

Therefore I oppose this rule. Not because the bill is a bad bill; not because we should not look at the Executive government; but because it is time to first look at ourselves, and it is time, indeed, for Congress to decide that it, too, should obey the law of the land.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, find myself in a very unusual situation coming to the floor today, speaking in favor of this rule, because I am normally one on my side that joins forces with my good friend from Mississippi and the gentlewoman from Illinois and certainly my good friend from Missouri.

I want the membership to know that I have another side to my personality. I am a Democrat that believes in fairness, one that believes in equity, and one that believes in justice; and that is what we are talking about today; we are talking about justice.

I would like to address briefly a couple of points that have been made. One of the speakers said, "What's the hurry? Why should we get in a hurry to study inequities in our pay practices on the Federal level?"

Well, there is a reason why we should get in a hurry: The last time we looked at this was 1923. I think 62 years is long enough without evaluating our pay and classification system; 62 years, and we have not examined how we treat our employees on the Federal level.

Also, it was mentioned that this was going to cost too much. Well, let me share with you what the real costs are today; the real costs are the numerous lawsuits that we are settling or losing in our Federal courts because we have not implemented a fair pay system.

Also, it has been said that if we have a study something bad is going to happen. I do not think anything bad is going to happen. I have heard some of my colleagues on the floor during special orders talking about all the economic theories and all of that, and I listened to all of it, but my basic problem is one from conviction and one from conscience: How can I go home and look at my three daughters—I have three daughters and three sons. I know not only in my mind, I know in my heart if they go to work for the Federal Government; the one government that is supposed to be setting the example, that my three sons will have an advantage over my three daughters, and that is not right.

I also would be remiss if I did not stand and speak out for the many constituents that I have in my district in Arkansas that are not being treated fairly.

In closing, I would just like to say this: This is not a conservative issue; this is not a liberal issue; this is a fair-

ness issue, and I urge my colleagues, please vote for the rule.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. I think the American women and minorities would like to know the names, specifically, of the businesses that endorse what the chamber is doing. Can you do that?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, I assume that is an implied threat, but we will not worry about that.

Ms. OAKAR. No, it is not an implied threat. Why don't you name the names?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, sure, I would be happy to. But I do not know if you want me to go through this whole litany, and I sure can't do it in 1 minute.

Ms. OAKAR. I think you should.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. OK. The American Hotel & Motel Association; the American Iron & Steel Institute; the American Legislative Exchange Council; the American Paper Institute; the American Retail Federation; the American Society for Personnel Administration.

Ms. OAKAR. No. I mean specific businesses. Anybody can name corporate institutions.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Lennox Industries; Caterpillar Tractor; Citizens for America; Master Printers of America.

Ms. OAKAR. No, that is not what I am talking about. Can you name a specific business, corporation—

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Did I not just mention one? Are your listening? I said Caterpillar Tractor. Did you not hear me?

Ms. OAKAR. Oh, Caterpillar Tractor. OK. You named one.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, I could name you a litany of them, but I cannot do it in the time allotted to me.

Ms. OAKAR. I suggest you put that in the RECORD, because my businesses are telling me they did not take a stand on this issue, and some are for it. And they belong to the local chamber. They are thinking about the national.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] has expired.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985. Let me say two things which, at first blush, sound contradictory. First, H.R. 3008 is the most important civil rights legislation to come to the House floor this session. Second, H.R. 3008 is a rather modest bill, in that it merely requires an independent study of whether the pay gap between men and women in the Federal Government is due to discrimination.

These two statements are really not a contradiction. There is undoubtedly a large wage gap between men and women in the Federal Government. Some of this gap is surely due to entirely reasonable factors, such as hours of work, seniority, educational level, and the like. But some of this gap cannot be explained by these factors. The study will determine if, where, and how severe women's wages are held down by illegal discrimination. Once we know the location and extent of the disease, we can act deliberately to remove it.

H.R. 3008 deals with discrimination against minorities, as well as discrimination against women. This is an important addition. It will help us locate instances where wages of an occupation are held low because most of the occupants are black or Hispanic.

For the second year in a row, Members have the opportunity to cast their votes for or against economic fairness for women employed by the Federal Government. Last year, 413 of us voted to take the first step toward eliminating discrimination. Unfortunately, the other body balked. They agreed, however, to have the General Accounting Office develop the framework for a pay equity study. On March 1, 1985, GAO released its findings. H.R. 3008 is directly based on that GAO report. H.R. 3008 is, therefore, even sounder and more carefully developed than the legislation we passed last year. Indeed, the American delegation to the U.N. Conference on Women came back with a resolution supporting pay equity. The President's own daughter led that delegation. Who are we to say no to Maureen Reagan?

H.R. 3008 says that the Federal Government will not tolerate discrimination in any form. It does not change the basic law on discrimination; it merely finds out whether that law is being violated. H.R. 3008 is a natural successor to the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964—and essential to tackle the subtle forms of discrimination that have succeeded the blatant discrimination of 20 years ago.

The Federal Government is the largest single employer in the Nation. As such, it should set an example for the private sector. Yet, in attacking pervasive, subtle forms of discrimination, the Federal Government is lagging far behind the 35 States and numerous towns and cities that have already begun studies of their wage-setting practices.

Yesterday, I received a new GAO report entitled "Description of Selected Nonfederal Job Evaluation Systems," which described how States and private companies have dealt with the issue of discrimination against women. It shows how careful implementation

of corrective action can cure the problem without causing economic damage to the employer. The evidence should lay to rest concerns of some that correcting pay discrimination against women will bankrupt the Government. States such as Minnesota, and towns like Colorado Springs, CO, have identified steps to correct discriminatory pay practices without busting the budget.

H.R. 3008 requires a study of Federal classification and pay practices to determine if any elements discriminate on the basis of sex, race, or ethnicity. It acknowledges that women and minorities are clustered in the lowest grades in the Federal Government and asks why.

We took a first look at the wage gap in our 1982 hearings on pay equity. In joint hearings that Gerry Ferraro, MARY ROSE OAKAR and I held, we found that women are concentrated in a few, low-paying occupational categories. The largest occupational category in the Federal Government is secretary; 99 percent of secretaries are women and the average pay is \$15,800. The second largest is clerk-typist. It is 96 percent women and the average pay is \$11,600.

The General Accounting Office [GAO] released a study on November 27, 1984, of occupational segregation in the Federal Government and found that women are concentrated in grades 7 and below, while men are concentrated in grades 10 and above. GAO reported that at grade GS-6, women hold 75 percent of the jobs, while men hold 25 percent. Employees at grade 6 earn between \$16,000 and \$20,000. At grade GS-13, women hold only 12.4 percent of the jobs, while men fill 87.6 percent of the positions. Employees in grade 13 earn between \$36,000 and \$47,000.

Is this because the Federal Government intentionally discriminates against women? No. Rather, it's because the Federal Government sets its wages based on what the private sector does. Private sector wages show the effects of years of sex based discrimination. Remember, 25 years ago it was perfectly legal to advertise for male-only or female-only, or white-only jobs, and to pay the female-only and black-only jobs considerable less than would be paid to the white-male jobs. The civil rights legislation of the early 1960's made that type of discrimination illegal, but the pay systems in place now carry the baggage of those earlier years.

Is the market going to take care of this? It hasn't so far. In fact, the pay gap between men and women has increased in the past 20 years. This is because the number of women entering the labor force has burgeoned during this period.

Should the Office of Personnel Management do this study? OPM did what

it claimed was a pay equity study. In a letter to me yesterday, however, the GAO said, "in our opinion, the OPM draft report does not achieve the objectives of a pay equity study." We need an outside study, free of partisan politics. We need a study beyond reproach, done by an independent consultant under the guidance of a blue ribbon panel. And, that is what H.R. 3008 contains.

Is the pay gap between men and women due to different levels of experience, education, and hours of work? Some, but not all. The National Academy of Sciences concluded that these factors explained only a part of the pay differential. No study has shown that these factors explain more than half the wage differential. Does discrimination explain the other half? We don't know. That's why we need H.R. 3008.

The bill does not prejudice the question of how much of the existing wage gap is due to discrimination. A study may determine that much of the gap is caused by other factors. But it's a little like having chest pains. You should find out if it's indigestion or a heart attack.

Some of our colleagues have become pamphleteers against this legislation. One missive states "comparable worth, in the short run, would bring about a decline in productivity * * * in the long run, * * * certain economic stagnation." Certainly, Robert Isaacs, the mayor of Colorado Springs, CO, doesn't buy this. Over the past 5 years, Colorado Springs has implemented a plan to eliminate sex-based wage discrimination for its city employees. As Mayor Isaacs put it:

We did something fair and just, and in return we got ourselves great employee morale, lower turnover, and higher productivity. Isn't that what the private sector's always looking for?

The pamphleteers say that under comparable worth "pay scales would be subject to the whims of wage boards, instructed to ignore market factors * * *." This statement betrays ignorance of the Federal pay system. Federal employees wages are already set administratively. Right now, today, an administrative wage board, known as OPM, compares the worth of electricians and nurses, plumbers, and teachers. H.R. 3008 aims at finding out whether illegal discrimination enters into these wage determinations. Moreover, Federal wages are capped by legislation—many Federal employees think wages now are set or frozen at whim. Federal employees, especially senior managers and engineers are now paid under a wage system that ignores market factors, since the Government simply can't compete with IBM. It's been reported that back in 1964, Robert McNamara took a pay cut of \$575,000 to come to work for the Federal Government. His wage, and

those of his successors, have been set in ignorance of market factors.

Another pamphlet says "A comparable worth study * * * could * * * [lead to] implementing this disastrous system of wage setting within the Federal Government, and eventually extending this practice to private businesses. This is exactly what has happened in Washington State * * *." My, my, I did not know that Washington State private firms had their wages set by the State government. I sit on the Armed Services Committee and I haven't heard any complaints from Boeing about Washington State trying to adjust Boeing's pay scales.

The facts are that H.R. 3008 is only a study of the Federal Government and its employees. The bill does not make a pay policy for the Federal Government. It does not automatically increase anyone's wages. It does not give Congress, or anyone else, the power to set wages for private sector employees. Yet, by identifying wage discrimination, it serves as the most important civil rights legislation to come before this House. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. As I understand it, the gentlewoman indicated there has not been a study on this issue in the past.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. There has not been a study on the Federal classification system since 1923.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, I have before me a list of studies, 22 studies of Federal pay and classification, since 1949. Twenty-two.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. We are talking about looking for discrimination. The issue is, as you understand, the bill that took discrimination out was in 1964, which was clearly after 1923. Pre-1964 you could advertise jobs as women's jobs, as black jobs, and you could not afterward.

But I think what we want to make perfectly clear is, yes, indeed, there have been those kinds of studies. But the law changed drastically in 1964.

What the Washington case and what other cases have been about is going back to look at the classification system to find if the pre-1964 jobs that were advertised as black or Hispanic or white or women have got discrimination cranked into the classification system along with the other things. That is all the study is looking at. That is what is going on in cities, that is what is going on in States, that is what we would like to see go on in the Federal Government, because we are now 22 years behind complying with the 1964 law.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Well, I yielded to the gentleman, and you cannot tell me of a Federal study to come forward to show that we are complying with the 1964 law.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, I have one right here that was done in 1984, "Equal Worth, Comparable Worth and Market Worth, a Federal Job Study of the Federal Government's Pay Classification and Qualification System for Employment" by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management. It is right here. Would you like to see a copy of it?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Yes, but in our opinion, that OPM draft did not achieve those objectives.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Oh, in your opinion.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If I can yield to the chairwoman, we know exactly about that study, and she has been an expert on this. Let me yield to the chairwoman, and tell him about that study.

Ms. OAKAR. If I could just quote from the letter from GAO, whose appointed Director is appointed by the President, he says: "In our opinion, the OPM draft report does not achieve the objectives of pay equity study as you have defined them."

We also have another letter from Mrs. Cornelius, who is the Acting Director of OPM right now, in which she implies that they are going to discard that study. As you know, that was held by—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] has expired.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. I was just going to say that I think the study, if they want to bring it up during the course of debate, I would love to bring up that study. And Dr. Devine, who is no longer with us, thanks to the Republican controlled Senate, has confirmed it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. We would be very happy to discuss that study, which was not a study at all, according to objective agencies and people of both parties. But we are right back to where we were. I think this is a very simple request. It is long overdue. It is just, it is fair. And all of the other things that are being thrown up I honestly think are smokescreens. So let us proceed and let us get on with it. Really, I do think over 200 years is long enough.

□ 1700

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RUDD].

Mr. RUDD. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3008, the so-called Federal Equi-

table Pay Practices Act. This legislation is not about equal pay for equal work. That policy has already been the law of the land for more than 20 years. This legislation proposes to implement the concept of equal pay for unequal work through the subjective setting of wages by some Government-appointed board of "experts" without regard to market factors. It is one step closer to a government-controlled and planned economy.

Just last week, a letter was hand-delivered to my office by the Concerned Women for America [CWA], the largest women's organization in the country with over 500,000 members, in strong opposition to this legislation.

CWA's president, Beverly Lahaye, accurately pointed out that this legislation "paves the way for transforming our society from a free enterprise system, in which the marketplace and the laws of supply and demand operate to set wages, to a socialistic or planned economy in which Government officials, judges or consultants determine wages according to an arbitrary and subjective point system * * * a study opens the door for court-ordered imposition of pay equity or comparable worth as occurred in a case involving the State of Washington * * * pay equity may cost the Federal Government over \$6 billion."

If put into place nationwide for all employment, the cost could skyrocket to as much as \$320 billion.

Let's be clear what we're voting on in this legislation. It is not simply a study of Federal pay practices. If a study is conducted and inequities are discovered—a near certainty given the biased makeup of the proposed board—the Government would be required to implement the recommendations or stand a good chance of a lawsuit as happened in Washington State in the case of American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees [AFSCME] Versus the State of Washington. In that case, the court ordered the State to immediately raise the wages of 15,500 State employees in predominantly female job classifications, and awarded back pay to the employees retroactive to September 1979.

Pay equity, or comparable worth, completely redefines discrimination. It is based on the erroneous assumption that every job has a measureable economic worth that can be judged free of bias and that dissimilar jobs can be objectively compared. It would prohibit an evaluation of other vital wage determinants such as the marketplace, unions, benefit packages, seniority and individual merit. It ignores the economic forces of supply and demand in the labor market.

To demonstrate the folly of this concept, in the Washington case, a clerical supervisor got higher ratings than a chemist; an electrician was given the

same number of points for knowledge, skill and mental demands as a beginning secretary; and truck drivers ranked at the bottom, below telephone operators or retail clerks. Comparing dissimilar jobs, compensating for different working conditions, motivations, merit and changing demands of the marketplace cannot be done objectively or accurately by any Government entity. Only the dynamics of the marketplace can fairly and accurately determine their value.

This legislation is not concerned with equity. It is a clear and dangerous step toward Government control of our economy, and I urge its defeat.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate on the rule and I have heard a debate on the bill, and I think therein is my basis for objecting to this rule at this time. If nothing else, we have seen in this last 45 or 50 minutes what a tremendously important, complex, and complicated issue we are dealing with here. One that has not only fascinating and complex substantive dimensions to it, but also methodological dimensions to it that are just incredibly fascinating.

The idea that a regression model with 27 variables may have been considered an inadequate study fascinates me when one with 4 variables was considered quite adequate and acceptable.

So we have here then a rule that says let us talk about all of these very intriguing, complicated, difficult issues on a subject that everybody must concede is critically important in 1 hour. I object to the rule.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have been watching with some puzzlement some of this debate here. First of all, how anybody could suggest with a straight face that this is anything more than a study in its present form is amazing to me because I think that there ought to be a requirement for better reading comprehension skills as a condition precedent to sitting in this body.

Second, for those of you who are concerned that this commission is likely to do anything, the only thing they can do is write a report which they will send to the President of the United States. And if the President acts crazy and radical, he will send us outrageously expensive legislation which GENE TAYLOR and I will promptly begin studying for the next 10 years.

You do not have to worry about the process suddenly being substituted. There is nobody who is going to get a bill out of our committee that is going to put us out of the business of being the committee that will ultimately decide what pay is.

What is the alternative to this study? The alternative is the legislation already pending in this Congress that would, without a study, impose some form of comparable worth measure in our Federal payroll system, and I am unwilling at this point to move with a bill like that because I do not know what the consequences of that would be. I really do not know whether we know enough about it to know how to apply it. I think that this is a responsible way to go about getting to the nub of the whole problem that is raised by people who accurately give us on the committee examples of whole areas of the Government where, because of the nature of the people who populate the jobs, they seem to get left out when adjustments are made.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has expired.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I continue to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I share your concern about this, that is why I have a substitute, which I will propose later, because I think it should be looked into.

One of the questions I have—

Mr. FORD of Michigan. If the gentleman will let me reclaim part of my time. If the gentleman had a serious substitute, I would be willing to sit down and talk to him about it. But when I see him notify us that he is going to offer 80-some amendments to this bill, ranging in everything from the kitchen sink to the back door, I do not think that the gentleman is demonstrating the kind of sincerity about wanting to improve this bill or improve the study that would warrant serious consideration of his substitute. So I probably will have to oppose that along with the other 80 amendments that you have.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield, I understand. Let me just ask if it is a big concern as it appears to be to all the people in the Chamber today, why is it that we get a committee report at 1 o'clock today and we are asked to move this thing forward immediately? Why not give the Members of this body a little time to study that report so they can be conversant with the subject matter?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I certainly do not want to offend the gentleman or anyone else. He was the one who insisted that GENE TAYLOR insist on the full period of time for the minority members of the committee to write a minority report on the bill, and to accommodate that, we ran up against this adjournment date. That is not a problem we thought was going to happen.

We did not anticipate the gentleman's, at least I did not, enthusiastic opposition to the bill which materialized to my knowledge rather late. When I saw the ranking minority member on the committee changing the bill in a form that made it acceptable to him, I said, "My God, if you can satisfy JOHN MYERS, certainly nobody is going to complain." I was shocked to find that the other gentleman from Indiana does not quite agree with JOHN MYERS.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have used almost all the allotted time for this debate. Not only of the rule, but it appears, of the bill. There seem to be two major objections as to why this rule should not pass today.

One of those being that the rule is not completely open and specifically in regard to allowing the amendment of the gentlewoman from Illinois to be included. There are those of us who indicated in the Rules Committee that we were empathetic to the kinds of concerns that the gentlewoman was raising.

But specifically in regard to the question of why her particular amendment should be put on this bill, she replied that she would be willing to try anything. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessarily appropriate that that particular amendment be put on this rule and in fact, since that was a change, call it a change in the Civil Rights Law of 1964, and this bill is merely calling for a study, the Rules Committee quite rightfully did not allow a waiver of germaneness to allow that particular amendment to be discussed.

In light of the fact that it is very clear that the provisions of this piece of legislation are well known to both sides of the aisle, that it has been through 4 years of testimony in the House of Representatives; that some 80 to 100 amendments are now waiting on the floor for consideration of this particular rule, there does not appear to be any question but that we are not proceeding in undue haste. In fact, the question would better be put, is there any reason to delay? Since there is no obvious reason to delay, I would move the previous question and urge that the resolution be adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 292, nays 133, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

YEAS—292

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Ackerman | Dwyer | Kostmayer |
| Addabbo | Dymally | LaFalce |
| Akaka | Dyson | Lantos |
| Anderson | Early | Leach (IA) |
| Andrews | Eckart (OH) | Lehman (CA) |
| Annunzio | Edgar | Lehman (FL) |
| Anthony | Edwards (CA) | Leland |
| Applegate | English | Lent |
| Aspin | Erdreich | Levin (MI) |
| Atkins | Evans (IA) | Levine (CA) |
| AuCoin | Evans (IL) | Lewis (FL) |
| Barnard | Fascell | Lipinski |
| Barnes | Fazio | Lloyd |
| Bateman | Feighan | Long |
| Bates | Fish | Lowry (WA) |
| Bedell | Flippo | Luken |
| Bellenson | Florio | Lundine |
| Bennett | Foglietta | MacKay |
| Bentley | Foley | Manton |
| Bereuter | Ford (MI) | Markey |
| Berman | Ford (TN) | Martinez |
| Bevill | Fowler | Matsui |
| Biaggi | Frank | Mazzoli |
| Boehrlert | Frenzel | McCloskey |
| Boggs | Frost | McCurdy |
| Boland | Fuqua | McDade |
| Boner (TN) | Garcia | McHugh |
| Bonior (MI) | Gaydos | McKernan |
| Bonker | Gejdenson | McKinney |
| Borski | Gephardt | Meyers |
| Bosco | Gibbons | Mica |
| Boucher | Gilman | Mikulski |
| Boxer | Glickman | Miller (OH) |
| Breaux | Gonzalez | Mineta |
| Brooks | Goodling | Mitchell |
| Brown (CA) | Gordon | Moakley |
| Brown (CO) | Gray (IL) | Mollohan |
| Bruce | Gray (PA) | Montgomery |
| Bryant | Green | Moody |
| Burton (CA) | Guarini | Morrison (CT) |
| Bustamante | Gunderson | Morrison (WA) |
| Byron | Hall (OH) | Mrazek |
| Carper | Hamilton | Murphy |
| Carr | Hatcher | Murtha |
| Chandler | Hawkins | Myers |
| Chappell | Hayes | Natcher |
| Clay | Heftel | Neal |
| Clinger | Henry | Nelson |
| Coelho | Hertel | Nichols |
| Coleman (MO) | Holt | Nowak |
| Coleman (TX) | Hopkins | O'Brien |
| Collins | Horton | Oaker |
| Conte | Howard | Oberstar |
| Conyers | Hoyer | Obey |
| Cooper | Hubbard | Ortiz |
| Coyne | Huckaby | Owens |
| Crockett | Hughes | Panetta |
| Daniel | Jacobs | Pease |
| Darden | Jeffords | Penny |
| Daschle | Jenkins | Pepper |
| Davis | Johnson | Perkins |
| de la Garza | Jones (NC) | Petri |
| Dellums | Jones (OK) | Pickle |
| Derrick | Jones (TN) | Price |
| Dicks | Kanjorski | Pursell |
| Dixon | Kaptur | Rahall |
| Donnelly | Kastenmeier | Rangel |
| Dorgan (ND) | Kennelly | Ray |
| Dowdy | Kildee | Regula |
| Downey | Kindness | Reid |
| Duncan | Kleczka | Richardson |
| Durbin | Kolter | Ridge |

| | | |
|--------------|-------------|------------|
| Rinaldo | Smith (NJ) | Visclosky |
| Robinson | Snowe | Volkmer |
| Rodino | Solarz | Walgren |
| Roe | St Germain | Watkins |
| Roemer | Staggers | Waxman |
| Rose | Stallings | Weaver |
| Rostenkowski | Stark | Weiss |
| Roukema | Stokes | Wheat |
| Rowland (GA) | Stratton | Whitley |
| Russo | Studds | Whitten |
| Sabo | Swift | Williams |
| Savage | Synar | Wilson |
| Scheuer | Tallon | Wirth |
| Schneider | Tauke | Wise |
| Schroeder | Tauzin | Wolf |
| Schumer | Thomas (CA) | Wolpe |
| Seiberling | Thomas (GA) | Wright |
| Sharp | Torres | Wyden |
| Shelby | Torricelli | Wyllie |
| Sikorski | Towns | Yates |
| Slusky | Traffant | Yatron |
| Skelton | Traxler | Young (AK) |
| Slattery | Udall | Young (FL) |
| Smith (FL) | Valentine | Young (MO) |
| Smith (IA) | Vander Jagt | |
| Smith (NE) | Vento | |

NAYS—133

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Archer | Hammerschmidt | Parris |
| Armey | Hansen | Pashayan |
| Badham | Hartnett | Porter |
| Bartlett | Hendon | Quillen |
| Barton | Hiller | Ritter |
| Billakis | Hillis | Roberts |
| Bliley | Hunter | Rogers |
| Boulter | Hutto | Roth |
| Broomfield | Hyde | Rowland (CT) |
| Broyhill | Ireland | Rudd |
| Burton (IN) | Kasich | Saxton |
| Callahan | Kemp | Schaefer |
| Campbell | Kolbe | Schuetz |
| Carney | Kramer | Schulze |
| Chapple | Lagomarsino | Sensenbrenner |
| Cheney | Latta | Shaw |
| Coats | Leath (TX) | Shumway |
| Cobey | Lewis (CA) | Shuster |
| Coble | Lightfoot | Siljander |
| Combest | Livingston | Skeen |
| Coughlin | Lott | Slaughter |
| Courter | Lowery (CA) | Smith (NH) |
| Craig | Lujan | Smith, Denny |
| Dannemeyer | Lungren | Smith, Robert |
| Daub | Mack | Snyder |
| DeLay | Madigan | Solomon |
| DeWine | Marlenee | Spence |
| Dickinson | Martin (IL) | Spratt |
| DioGuardi | Martin (NY) | Stangeland |
| Dornan (CA) | McCaIn | Stenholm |
| Dreier | McCandless | Strang |
| Eckert (NY) | McCollum | Stump |
| Edwards (OK) | McEwen | Sundquist |
| Emerson | McGrath | Sweeney |
| Fawell | McMillan | Swindall |
| Fiedler | Michel | Taylor |
| Fields | Miller (WA) | Vucanovich |
| Franklin | Mollinari | Walker |
| Gallo | Monson | Weber |
| Gekas | Moore | Whitehurst |
| Gingrich | Moorhead | Whittaker |
| Gradison | Nielson | Wortley |
| Gregg | Olin | Zschau |
| Grotberg | Oxley | |
| Hall, Ralph | Packard | |

NOT VOTING—8

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| Alexander | Hefner | Miller (CA) |
| Crane | Loeffler | Roybal |
| Dingell | Mavroules | |

□ 1720

Mr. OLIN changed his voice vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING PASSAGE OF RESOLUTION 3379 IN THE U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 98) condemning the passage of Resolution 3379, in the U.N. General Assembly on November 10, 1975, and urging the U.S. Ambassador and U.S. delegation to take all appropriate actions necessary to erase this shameful resolution from the record of the United Nations, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 98

Whereas, on November 10, 1975, the thirtieth session of the United Nations General Assembly adopted Resolution 3379 which sought to legitimize the lie, first perpetrated at the United Nations General Assembly by representatives of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics in 1963, that Zionism is a form of racism; and

Whereas Resolution 3379 of the thirtieth United Nations General Assembly directly contravenes the most basic principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and undermines universal human rights values and principles; and

Whereas that infamous resolution threatens directly the integrity and legitimacy of a member state by singling out for slanderous attack the national movement which gave birth to the State of Israel; and

Whereas the adoption of Resolution 3379 by the thirtieth United Nations General Assembly constituted one of that organization's darkest moments and may fuel the flames of antisemitism and anti-Zionism; and

Whereas the United States Congress sharply condemned the passage of Resolution 3379 ten years ago "in that said resolution encourages antisemitism by wrongly associating and equating Zionism with racism": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress—

(1) soundly denounces and condemns any linkage between Zionism and racism;

(2) considers UNGA Resolution 3379 to be a permanent smear upon the reputation of the United Nations and to be totally inconsistent with that organization's declared purposes and principles;

(3) unequivocally states that the premise of UNGA Resolution 3379 which equates Zionism with racism is itself clearly a form of bigotry; and

(4) formally repudiates UNGA Resolution 3379, and calls upon the Parliaments of all countries which value freedom and democracy to do the same.

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 98. This resolution condemns the passage of U.N. Resolution 3379,

which was adopted by the General Assembly in November of 1975 and calls on the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to erase this shameful resolution from the record of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, U.N. Resolution 3379 seeks to legitimize the vicious lie that Zionism is a form of racism. Originally sponsored by the Soviet Union, this initiative is an insult to the American people and reflects poorly on the nations which voted for it. The adoption of this resolution represents the nadir of the United Nations. It is an affront to the American people and is an outright form of bigotry.

Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that this U.N. initiative was first put forth by the Soviet Union. After all, the Soviet Union symbolizes anti-Semitism in its lowest form. U.N. resolution 3379 is a blatant lie and an exercise in double speak. It is an attack on a democratic nation which respects human rights, Israel.

Mr. Speaker, U.N. Resolution 3379 makes a mockery of the United Nations. To make matters worse, similar resolutions are regularly sponsored in various U.N. agencies and conferences, and the United States must do all it can, power to prevent their adoption. As a supporter of the United Nations, it seems to me that if we must continue to expend our resources to defeat initiatives designed to attack the Jewish people and Israel, the United States should reconsider its policy toward the entire U.N. system.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, by calling on the parliaments of all countries to repudiate U.N. Resolution 3379, Senate Joint Resolution 98 sends a clear signal to our friends in the international community that resolutions attacking Zionism and Israel will be viewed as an attack on the United States and will not be tolerated. I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution.

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 98, condemning the passage of Resolution 3379, in the U.N. General Assembly on November 10, 1975, and urging the U.S. Ambassador and U.S. delegation to take all appropriate actions necessary to erase the resolution from the record of the United Nations.

Senate Joint Resolution 98 was passed by the Senate on July 9. A companion measure, House Joint Resolution 3379, was introduced in the House by the Honorable JOSEPH J. DIOGUARDI. At the outset, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, the Honorable Gus YATRON, as well as my other colleagues on the committee, in particular the ranking minority member, the Honorable WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, and the

Honorable BENJAMIN A. GILMAN for their continuing interest and efforts on behalf of this and related issues.

Passage of U.N. Resolution 3379, a decade ago, served no useful function then, nor does it now. It should be repudiated. It made an inaccurate and unfair linkage equating Zionism with racism. That resolution not only had no beneficial results, but instead has proved detrimental by provoking feelings of anti-Semitism, and attacks on the State of Israel and its people. As the Helsinki accords, with precepts embracing universal human rights principles, now celebrate their 10-year anniversary, it is timely to underscore those principles here.

Over the years, there have been resolutions and actions in the United Nations too numerous to cite here which have repeatedly singled out and targeted Israel for abuse and/or exclusion from various U.N. bodies or conferences. Such activities, which tend to politicize the organization and divert attention away from the true purposes and goals of the United Nations, are not in the best interests of the United Nations or the world community.

The resolution now before us denounces UNGA Resolution 3379, and urges other freedom-loving nations to also repudiate that resolution. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 98.●

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer my support of the resolution before us.

As my colleagues well remember, the United Nations passed Resolution 3379 in 1975. That resolution claimed that Zionism was a form of racism. It is interesting to note that it was the Soviet Union that first presented that lie at the United Nations in 1963. Given the human rights record of that police state, their criticism is somewhat like the pot calling the kettle black.

That unfortunate resolution contravenes the basic principles of the U.N. Charter. It undermines human rights values and principles. It already threatens the legitimacy of a member state by slandering it with untruths.

Over the years, much criticism has been directed at the United Nations. Many Members of this body have defended that organization. A resolution of this nature, however, only fuels the fires of anti-United Nations sentiments in the Congress and in America. That resolution undermines the credibility, the balance, and the integrity of the United Nations. It makes Israel appear to be a whipping boy for the many bigoted countries around the world which oppose the existence of that country.

It is incumbent upon all of us here today to make a statement about this injustice. The passage of that unfortunate resolution has stained the good reputation which the United Nations

deserves. I call upon my colleagues to join me in condemning any linkage between Zionism and racism.●

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution (S.J. Res. 98) condemning the passage of Resolution 3329, in the General Assembly on November 10, 1975, and urging the U.S. Ambassador and U.S. delegation to take all necessary actions to expunge the resolution from the record.

Mr. Speaker, the equation of Zionism with racism is one of the worst libels ever to be spoken; it is the most odious statement ever made by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly resolution of which we speak today has come to have a life of its own. It was bad enough that the General Assembly passed it. But the slander it contains has been repeated and debated time and time again in forums associated with the United Nations, injecting unwanted division and tensions into what should be useful and productive meetings on international affairs.

As a former member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations General Assembly, I know that the statements of that body can and often do result in much good; but the character of the United Nations itself has been degraded by this racism resolution, casting doubt on all the good work that is done there. This I regret very much.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, and the leadership of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for bringing this matter to the House floor for our consideration today. I would like to thank all those who have worked on this issue, in the other body and in the general public, for keeping this issue before us. The Equation of Zionism with racism is slander which we can and must erase from the records of the international community.●

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution. Ten years ago this autumn, the United Nations adopted a resolution that condemned Zionism as a "form of racism," a "racist and imperialist ideology," and a "threat to world peace." On the 10th anniversary of the adoption of that resolution by the United Nations, it is important for our country to again go on record in opposition to it.

When the U.N. Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural Committee first considered the anti-Zionism resolution, our representative, Leonard Garment, called the resolution "a supreme act of deceit * * * and a massive attack on the moral realities of the world." He

went on to describe the resolution as an official U.N. endorsement of anti-Semitism. And concerning passage of the resolution, he said, "I choose my words carefully when I say that this is an obscene act."

Later on, in the General Assembly, our Ambassador, DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, who now serves as senior Senator from my home State of New York, made many of the same points Mr. Garment expressed in committee and went on to discuss the serious repercussions the anti-Zionism resolution was likely to have throughout the world. Despite the fact that we were defeated, our men at the United Nations, Leonard Garment and Pat MOYNIHAN, put forth a sterling effort and made our country's revulsion at this resolution crystal clear to every delegate from every country at the United Nations.

Without taking much more of the committee's time, Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude with two observations based on what Leonard Garment and Pat MOYNIHAN told the United Nations a decade ago.

First, they made very clear that the passage of a resolution intended to discredit the State of Israel would have the ironic effect of discrediting the United Nations itself. And that has certainly proven to be true. I can think of no better example than the anti-Zionism resolution to illustrate the radical departure of the United Nations from the ideals and principles that led to its own founding back in 1945.

Perhaps no single event in the U.N.'s entire history has held up the United Nations to more disrepute than the passage of the anti-Zionism, anti-Israel resolution in 1975.

Secondly, our Ambassador and his associates emphasized that the American people would never forget the anti-Zionism resolution. Indeed, Pat MOYNIHAN rose in the General Assembly to declare a day of infamy when the resolution passed. He recognized then, as all of us have, that the anti-Zionism resolution was a frontal assault on the legitimacy of the State of Israel, as well as an attack on Jewish people in the United States.

And so, it is very important that we, as representatives of the American people, pass a resolution once again calling public attention to the monstrous lies that were propagated by the U.N. General Assembly. I hope that passage of the resolution before us can contribute to a more constructive atmosphere at the United Nations itself by making clear that all people of all countries who value freedom and democracy reject the blatant anti-Semitism and the perverted sociology that led to U.N. Resolution 3379.●

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1730

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on Senate Joint Resolution 98, just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

TEXT OF AMENDMENT MODIFYING 1961 DEFENSE NUCLEAR COOPERATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND FRANCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-92)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Thursday, August 1, 1985.)

FEDERAL EQUITABLE PAY PRACTICES ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 241 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3008.

□ 1732

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3008) to promote equitable pay practices and to eliminate discrimination within the Federal civil service, with Mr. KILDEE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, today the House is considering a bill, H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Prac-

tices Act of 1985. H.R. 3008 is quite direct and quite straightforward.

As many of you know, I chair a subcommittee related to how we pay and what benefits classified Federal employees receive.

H.R. 3008 is quite direct and forthright. The bill simply requires a study to determine whether the Federal pay and classification systems are effective in terms of gender, race, and Hispanic origin. It establishes an 11-member bipartisan commission to select and oversee an independent consultant who performs the study. The commission reviews the consultant's findings, issues a report with its views and recommendations to the President and to the Congress.

The commission then disbands within 90 days after the reports are submitted.

We have not studied this type of information since 1923 when the classification system for Federal employees existed.

My bill passed the House, which was slightly different, but the same thrust of the bill passed the House last year 413 to 6. There were no Democrats who voted against it and very few Republicans who did not support the bill.

I know that apparently this year there has been some kind of misrepresentation of the bill. That is why I would like to clarify what the bill does.

The Senate has introduced a bill that is very, very similar. It is a bipartisan bill, introduced by Senator EVANS of the State of Washington, along with the distinguished Senator from California, Senator CRANSTON. They have had extensive hearings, just as we have, from people who agreed with the substance of the bill and people who disagreed and wanted to make recommendations. That is why when I reintroduced the bill with 102 cosponsors on the first day of introduction in a bipartisan fashion, we added the qualification related to the study of an economic analysis. That was the recommendation of the minority. We added that.

The other thing we added was a different makeup of the Commission at the recommendation of the minority, a bipartisan commission to select members of it.

The other thing we added after we had countless hearings and after we saw what indeed a number of States and local governments are doing, we added that we felt not only women should be looked at in terms of the perspective of the classification system, we felt minorities—and I want to emphasize this to my colleagues because this is not only a women's issue, it is a family issue and it is an issue that relates to minorities as well—we added minorities and we added Hispanics, because in various studies that have been done in the classification

system, we know that Hispanics, blacks, and women are clustered on the bottom rungs of the classification system, so we added those.

It is interesting to me that we have such a cross-section of individuals who support the bill. There is the Congressional Black Caucus, the Congressional Women's Issue Caucus, our Hispanic Caucus, the Federation of Business and Professional Women, nurses, teachers, Latin American citizens, their league, the National Political Congress of Black Women, the League of Women Voters, hardly a radical group, and various industrial unions, unions whether they are blue-collar representatives or white-collar representatives, all the AFL-CIO representatives, and we could go on and on about who really is for the bill.

What we are talking about basically is the fact that the Federal Government really should take a look at how it treats its classified employees, something that I have, as the Chair of the subcommittee, jurisdiction over.

When GAO, at the request of people like Senator STEVENS and others, and myself, did a preliminary study in terms of the Federal work force, for example, they found that the disparity between white-collar workers who were male and female was \$11,000 annually.

Now, we are not saying necessarily that the disparity is due solely to discrimination, but we are saying that it is interesting that we have not taken a look at that system and what contributes to that disparity.

We also know that this is a national phenomenon. I want to make this very, very clear. Every study should be made internally and on an individual entity. One study for one State does not relate to a study that another State does.

□ 1740

We believe very strongly that our study only applies to federally classified employees. It does not apply to any corporations, although a number of very fine corporations, like AT&T, United States Steel, J. Byron and Sons department store chain in the South, have done their own internal studies, made recommendations, and ultimately it is my understanding, made changes. But we do not believe that this study should apply to any other group, only classified Federal employees.

So all of the fear tactics that relate to this issue are for naught. We know that 45 States, 45 States have either completed their study or are in the process of completing a study. My own State of Ohio, I am proud to say, is about to complete its study on how it treats its own employees, its own State employees.

It is interesting that many States have implemented their studies and they have found that, in fact, that it did not bankroll their payroll. As a matter of fact, what happened was that they increased their productivity and the morale of their workers. They also in some cases, they testified, increased the economy of their State when they made the necessary changes, and I know we have very fine authorities who can speak to that.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to take these few minutes to say that I for one, think, and this is very important to me, that I am privileged to be a Member of this body. This is the same body that passed the Civil Rights Act in the 1960's. This is the same body that passed the Equal Pay Act in the 1960's. This is the same body that passed the Fair Credit Act in the 1970's that gave women an opportunity for access to fairness issues in terms of credit. This is the same body that introduced the 19th amendment that gave women the right to vote, which they ultimately received in 1920.

Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat dismayed by the tone of the rhetoric used with respect to this issue. I consider myself a red-blooded American woman, proud of her roots as an American, proud of the contributions of her parents, and brothers, and sisters. I really must say I have been somewhat dismayed by the rhetoric in various speeches, when most of us are not here.

But nonetheless, let us today, at long last, lift this Chamber to the loftiness that it can have in terms of dialog. We are the Chamber that passed the Civil Rights Act. I think it is about time we deal not with personalities, and not in issues that will somehow alienate people. I think it is about time we deal with issues that relate to fairness.

We can do it. We have done it before and shown that the Congress can show off its best qualities. Let us do it today. It is about time. And it is about time we treated our minorities, and women who have served the Federal Government for many years with justice.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3008, the Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985. This legislation calls for a study of the Federal wage and classification systems to make sure that we are paying fairly the men and women who work for the Federal Government. And I would like at the outset to remind my colleagues that essentially the same legislation passed this body last year by a vote of 413 to 6.

I want, however, to express my disappointment that the legislation we are considering today only addresses the problem of wage discrimination in the executive branch. This problem is not confined to those in the executive branch, and a number of us have worked for some time to address the problem of employment discrimination among our own employees: The men and women who work for the Congress.

In fact, this issue was raised on June 22 last year during debate on the rule for the legislation of the gentleman from Ohio. At that time, the Rules Committee had refused to waive the germaneness requirement against an amendment to incorporate the legislative branch into the study. During debate on the rule, a commitment was made to bring my legislation to the floor before the end of the session.

Well, another year has passed. Today we are considering legislation for a study of the executive branch for the second time, and I regret to say that neither my legislation nor other legislation to address the problem of employment discrimination in the legislative branch has been considered by the House.

I would like to acknowledge the concerted efforts of those who have worked hard to see that our commitment to fair employment practices and compensation extends to the legislative branch as well. The gentleman from California, Mr. HAWKINS, the former chairman of the House Administration Committee, held hearings on my legislation last year, and was as sincere in his effort to eliminate discrimination in the legislative branch as he is in his commitment to eliminate discrimination against all workers. I am also pleased that the gentleman from California, Mr. PANETTA, held hearings just last week on my legislation, as well as several other proposals before his subcommittee.

Hearings on this problem, however, are not sufficient. As we move to consider this bill today I only wish we could coordinate our efforts on this issue so that Federal employees in both the executive and legislative branches would receive the protections due them.

These concerns aside, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3008 because it is a fair and straightforward approach to addressing an important problem. The Federal wage system established in 1923 has never been reviewed in its entire 62 year history. I don't think there is anything left we haven't studied, let alone ignored, for 62 years.

H.R. 3008 would simply provide for this long overdue study of compensation in those occupations which are held predominantly by one sex, or by one racial or ethnic group. The purpose of this study is to ensure that the

Federal Government—the Nation's largest employer—is complying with the laws which prohibit employment discrimination.

Let me reassure my colleagues on a couple of counts, since you have been subjected to an onslaught of misdirection and disinformation in recent days. This bill calls for a study, and only a study.

It applies to the Federal Government's civil service.

It does not affect State and local Government nor does it affect the private sector.

It will not create any sort of national wage scale or pay policy. Following completion of the study, a bipartisan commission will recommend remedies in the event that discriminatory practices are found. Implementation of the many possible remedies will require adoption of legislation by the Congress. In short, this is a very deliberate process being proposed here, not a headlong rush into uncharted territory.

Why then, Mr. Chairman, is the House nervous about acting? Why is there trepidation and concern about taking a step already taken by 22 different States? Twenty-two States, Mr. Chairman, have already completed or are in the process of completing similar studies. Six States have actually moved ahead to implement their findings. Only 5 States in the Nation have not examined the issue of sex-based wage discrimination through pay equity studies, legislation or collective bargaining.

Five States, Mr. Chairman, and the Congress of the United States. Not only have most of the States proceeded apace, but local governments, city governments have acted where the Congress has faltered.

Colorado Springs, CO hasn't been afraid to act.

Virginia Beach, VA hasn't been afraid to act.

Bellevue, WA hasn't been afraid to act.

Los Angeles and Long Beach CA haven't been afraid to act.

Each of these cities, and others, have moved ahead to study and to take action to eliminate discrimination, while the Congress argues about reviewing the Federal Government's own wage system for the first time in 62 years.

We have the ability to perform this review. Job evaluations, rather than being purely subjective, have been used in this country for over 50 years. Two-thirds of all employees in the U.S. companies that use some form of job evaluation to compare dissimilar jobs. I find it most ironic that the only time job evaluation techniques are called into question is when they are used to identify illegal wage discrimination. Since we are able to identify

wage discrimination, we have a responsibility to use that ability.

A pay equity study of the Federal Government will do us no harm, Mr. Chairman. Those who point to the lawsuit in Washington State do so with fine intentions but with muddled facts. Washington State was sued not because its wage-setting practices were inequitable, but because the State continued the discriminatory practices for 10 years after they were identified. I, for one, have enough faith in my colleagues to know that if any discriminatory practices were exposed, that they would not hesitate nor delay to act to rectify them promptly.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a simple question of fairness under the law of the land.

We are talking about the fact that 80 percent of the women working for the Federal Government are concentrated in grades 1 through 7, while 85 percent of the men can be found in grades 10 through 15.

We are talking about the \$9,000 earnings gap between what the Government pays women and what it pays men.

We are saying today that the Congress has a responsibility to find out why these women are concentrated in lower grades, and why they earn substantially less than men.

We are saying that the Congress passed this legislation by a vote of 413 to 6 last year, and that the situation demands just as strong a vote again this year.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I would ask how much time has been consumed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] has consumed 9 minutes and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding to me and I rise in support, strong support of the bill.

I want to address the reality of Connecticut's experience in this regard, because I think it is important for the Members to try to get a grasp of what this study means to people in their lives and to our society.

Connecticut passed exactly this kind of legislation. We did this study. Let us look at the result.

First of all, it did not create economic crisis nor class war. What did happen is that the hand of underpaid employees was strengthened at the bargaining table. Data led, research led to information, information led to the power to redress historic inequities. So instead of a 5-percent wage increase being adopted for everyone, a 2-percent wage increase was adopted for

everyone, and the rest of the money was set aside in an equity fund.

□ 1810

What was done with the equity fund? It was used to increase the salaries of those that the study had shown were relatively underpaid, considering their responsibilities and the qualifications that they had for the job.

What we are doing here is to adopt a bill that will do the study to provide information, then the next step as to what we shall do, as a consequence of that information, how we shall act, how we shall implement its findings, is indeed up to us and nothing will happen automatically, nothing will happen without our support.

But we will have the data through which we can understand and address inequities that are not malicious. They are not there because someone does not care about women, they are there because there historic presumptions many decades ago when those salaries were set.

I call your attention to the fact that clerical jobs right now in which woman dominate have salaries ranging from \$238 down to \$146. Similar jobs, clerical jobs in which men dominate, have salaries that start at \$288; and remember the top of the other category was \$238—and if I have more time later one I will tell you the other categories in detail—but these go all the way up to \$441.

Now that is not because anyone wanted to disadvantage women, but because many, many years ago when there were very few opportunities for women in the work force, obviously supply was great and demand was small, and supply and demand did establish a low wage base. From that base we have been providing the same increments to women that we have provided to men from a higher wage base.

So, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the debate that follows and urge my colleagues in supporting what is a good and sound piece of legislation.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARNES].

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of criticism of this bill. Those who misunderstand this legislation most have charged that it will cause every kind of mischief except clog kitchen sinks. I'd like to quote a warning from another member, a criticism that my colleagues by now will find familiar:

Although this bill may have motives in the finest tradition of gallantry, it actually is about as ungallant as a kick in the shins.

Testimony before the subcommittee suggests that its enactment would worsen rather than improve job opportunities for women . . . under compulsion of this bill, employers who contend that the employment costs for women are higher than for men will tend to cut back on female

employment . . . this legislation has the laudible objective of equal pay for women. If, in practice, it leads to fewer jobs for women, the victory will be Pyrrhic.

The Member of this body responsible for that dire prediction was Representative Paul Findley of Illinois, a member of the House Education and Labor Committee in 1963. He was addressing the House on H.R. 6060, which we know today as the Equal Pay Act of 1963.

Twenty-two years later, we are here again, rebutting the same arguments applied to H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act. Democrats and Republicans recognized the demagoguery in the Findley argument, and rejected it overwhelmingly—just as today, we are not going to be deterred by similar rhetoric.

H.R. 3008 does not expand the law, it does not threaten the private market place or labor markets with Government intervention, it will not lower anyone's pay, and it will not bust the budget.

If you believe these claims you have not studied H.R. 3008. You have not reviewed the General Accounting Office report upon which this bill is based, and you have not reviewed the legislative history that underlies Federal nondiscriminatory pay setting practices.

This legislation follows existing law: The Equal Pay Act of 1963 was developed by the Department of Labor by then Secretary Willard Wirtz. In Secretary Wirtz's letter to the President of the Senate, Lyndon Johnson, he explained that the legislation:

. . . has as its purpose the elimination of discrimination in wage rates based on sex where men and women performing comparable work for the same employer . . . those employers would be prohibited from paying a lower wage to one employee than they pay to an employee of the opposite sex in the same place of work for work of equal character requiring equal skill.

The debate today over the use of the concept of comparability closely parallels the debate of over 20 years ago. In the House, the language "equal work" was substituted for "comparable work" in an early version of the equal pay bill that the House and Senate considered but did not enact. In 1963, both the House and Senate made it clear that the legislation's use of equal pay for equal work would not be limited. The Senate openly struggled with the application of comparable worth:

With reference to the application of the equal pay concept, it was made plain in our hearings that for a number of years knowledge has been accumulating on means to test the relationship between jobs. Knowledge of this kind will be useful in determining "equal work" and "equal skills" for the purpose of administering S. 1409.

The National War Labor Board during World War II and the Wage Stabilization Board during the Korean war were required to make comparisons of jobs for "equal pay"

purposes. Their experience as well as the experience of arbitrators under contract provisions for equal pay, proves comparisons can be made successfully and put to the practical end of administering a Federal equal pay policy as contained in S. 1409.

H.R. 3008 does not subscribe to any "comparable worth" theory: critics charge that H.R. 3008 would lock the Government into a particular theory of comparable worth. Nothing in this legislation endorses such a theory. What we want to do is conduct a study along the lines the Senate charged us to follow 22 years ago.

We want to "use the experience we have in making pay comparisons," which goes back to World War II, to determine whether the Federal Government is following the Equal Pay Act of 1963, and section 2000e of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

As the distinguished chairwomen of the Compensation and Benefits Subcommittee, my good friend, Ms. OAKAR has stated, the Federal Government has never run such a check on itself, and it's high time.

We are not, as has been charged, prejudging the results, stacking the Commission, or trying to fabricate a basis for changing Federal pay. What we want to know is: (a) what factors that make up Federal jobs appear to be gender related, and (b) what other economic and nondiscriminatory factors contribute to the yawning gap in the wages paid to men and women who work for the Federal Government.

I, personally will not rest until I know why women on average in Federal service make \$12,000 a year less than men; and why most women are clustered at the very low end of the Federal pay scale and men dominate the highest paying jobs. If there is discrimination in the Federal pay system, there should not be a Member in this body who shrinks from having the facts laid out before us.

Our Federal Government Service Task Force ran a study on the consequences of low-paying Federal jobs on single women. We found that in Montgomery County, MD, my district, a single mother earns less than she needs to provide basic necessities to her family if she's a GS-7 secretary. Yet GS-level 7 and below are where women in Government are clustered. So this study goes beyond the equities, because we are talking about both fairness and need.

We do have the tools to do the study: Some Members still insist that after 22 years we still do not have the tools to complete the study H.R. 3008 proposes. The National Academy of Sciences disagrees, and reports that "job evaluations do provide a systematic method of comparing jobs to determine whether they are fairly compensated." The Academy also confirms that pay studies have served to reduce

discriminatory differences in pay. Well, it's no surprise, we had the tools in World War II, and we have them now.

A number of my colleagues have already addressed the question of the cost of a pay equity study to Government. I agree with the gentlelady from Ohio, if we do this right, it's going to save the Government money. It's going to be a boom for Federal workers and for the taxpayer. I'm convinced of that because we have always strengthened ourselves when we have gone after the facts about discrimination and laid them open to the public's conscience.

I am sure my colleagues will agree that after 22 years, the time has come for the Federal Government, as an employer, to accept its responsibility to study this important problem.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose it might be observed that I have been as visible with respect to this bill as any Member of the House, and I have even heard it said that I have been very tough on the bill. I suppose that is true, but if I am tough there is another side of my character as well. I am a Republican who believes in fairness, in equity, in equal rights and the Government's responsibility to guarantee and protect rights. I am also a father of a daughter for whom I want the very best and the husband of a very intelligent and bright professional woman emerging in her profession, and I am very concerned about all of these issues.

Mr. Chairman, I have a commitment that is deep and abiding to equal pay for equal work. But I also have several problems with this bill.

It is said that it is only a study. Now one of the things that distinguishes us as intelligent beings is that not only do we study but we study our studying. I have tried to do that in this case.

I found that the procedures and personnel by which we would establish this study lead me to grave concern. The study that is going to be productive must be objective. I have a concern about the commission and its composition.

Can it be objective when it is comprised of a balance of members who have already been on record as endorsing comparable worth? Will it lead to foregone conclusions regarding comparable worth? Would it set the stage for judicial implementation without congressional approval, as has been the unfortunate experience in other cases when only a study was authorized?

It is also argued that there has not been a study. I would suggest there

have been studies that have been ignored.

The Office of Personnel Management has recently completed a study with a very good model. Multiple regression models are very fascinating instruments and one with 27 variables is a very good model, especially when others that have been cited have as little as four variables.

The OPM study was professional and a well done job.

Mr. Chairman, that study concluded:

The effects of a society-wide imposition of such a scheme by the government are not difficult to predict. There would be class war. Contrary to comparable worth assumptions, it would not even be a sex based conflict. Rather, it would set blue collar men and women against white collar men and women.

That would be indeed unfortunate and quite likely an unfair outcome.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights did a study. They came to a similar conclusion.

These studies have been discounted, if not ignored. Is it possible that the sponsors of this bill want a study that can trump those studies?

I know what it is like to want things. I know how sincere the Members who support this bill are in what they want. But it is also absolutely imperative that, if you are going to study, you remain objective and scientific.

Comparable worth would be, in my estimation—and I have studied this several years—discriminatory. It would penalize blue-collar men and blue-collar women. It would penalize union jobs. It would penalize, and this I think is one of the most tragic things of all, women who have already made that step to nontraditional occupations. These are fears that I have.

Women in America do not even want comparable worth. Recent polls show that 80 percent of the women want to use enforcement of existing laws to end discrimination rather than passing new laws.

This is extremely important.

I am gravely concerned with the failure of U.S. Government agencies to enforce civil rights and equal rights legislation. I would be the first to be in the forefront to compel the enforcement of these laws.

Mr. Chairman, I have seen things such as sexual harassment go unpunished in universities, and I have seen Government agents for this Government encourage young women to let the case drop rather than to take up their case for them.

I would like to see this body consider the need and the alternative productivity of taking those existing laws and those existing agencies, putting their feet in the fire and bringing justice to American men and women through the implementation and enforcement of those laws.

□ 1800

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, of course I am in strong support of this legislation. We have been reading recently about the mounting hysteria and fear concerning the disease AIDS, and I do not think there is a single Member of this House that would not be on record saying we have got to take exhaustive studies to look at what is causing this disease.

I respectfully suggest to you that discrimination based on race or on sex, on ethnic origin is a disease, and for the life of me I cannot understand why there is this godawful fear about a study.

Maybe I do think I can understand it. I think there are some who are afraid of what we might find out; some who have deluded themselves into thinking that there is no longer a problem in terms of sex discrimination; well, that is not the way to operate. Let us find out what the problem is and do something about it.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, the Social Security Administration employs more than 80,000 people across the country. Of that 80,000, 3 percent are black males. That is all.

Walk into any agency, and as you move up toward the higher floors of the agency, it gets whiter and whiter and maler and maler. That is because the lower level jobs are consigned to those of us who are minority and those who are women.

You know, you almost got an opportunity to avoid me in this House. I worked as a clerk for the Social Security Administration at night, and I was a file clerk; I worked from 4 to 12, and I could see myself working my way up the ladder; one day becoming the Administrator for Social Security; and it dawned on me that that would never happen.

It would never happen. And so, when I realized the fruitlessness of that pursuit because I was black and male, I decided to join the Membership, and I know all are delighted that I made that decision.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985, and I do so for three reasons.

First of all, the bill is a bad management bill. Second, it is very costly, and its effect on the budget is something that we cannot afford today; and third, I strongly believe that we have current laws to prevent any inequities that are in our pay practices.

Let us talk about the bad management aspects of this bill. First of all, it is supposed to determine pay equity,

and if one is going to determine pay equity in the U.S. economy, one is going to have to consider market forces. Nowhere in this bill are market forces mentioned one time. The closest we get is a mention of "other forces" in one of the subparagraphs.

If there is only one person in this country, whether he be male, female, white, black, whatever; who has a skill that is in great demand, we are going to pay that individual more than if there are 10,000 people.

So I think that this bill is not being honest when it talks about pay equity, without mentioning market forces.

Second, I would like to point out is that the study has no flexibility at all. In fact, the study is precluded from coming up—the Commission is precluded from coming up with any recommendation that prevents a lowering of a grade or the lowering of a rate of pay.

Now, I do not believe that there is not one pay grade, one grade in the Federal system that is not rated too highly, and I do not believe that there is not one Federal worker somewhere in this country that is not being paid too much money.

So we have got a commission that, the only thing they can do is recommend that everybody's pay be raised, or everybody's grade be raised. That is like an automobile mechanic, if you took your car in and he says there is something wrong—he says, well the only thing to do is buy you a new car; let us go out and buy you a Cadillac. I do not think that is right.

Lastly, in order to enforce this study's commission, we would have to set up, in my opinion, a vast Federal bureaucracy to go in and look at all the multiple pay rates and pay grades and make sure that they are exactly as they should be.

As a second item, I would like to point out that the cost in the budget immediately is estimated to be anywhere from \$5 billion to \$8 billion. Now, those are conservative estimates.

If we get into the entire economy and not just in the Federal part of the pay system, it is estimated that it could cost as much as \$320 billion. Now in these times of budget restraints, I think we need to be concerned about that.

The last point is that we have an existing Equal Pay Act that has been in existence I believe since 1963, and so I really do not feel that we need to be even considering the study at this point in time.

So for those reasons; I think it is bad management; I think the effect on the budget is too costly; and I think we have current law today that will solve the problem.

I do not feel that we need to enact this legislation at this time.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the Chair the time I

have used and the time the minority has used.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] has 17½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has 14 minutes remaining.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SIKORSKI], a distinguished member of the committee who, by the way, introduced the study in Minnesota.

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, while the way of life that flourished at Tara has gone with the wind, the plantation mentality of inequality still lingers in 1985. Some private sector organizations with a stake in this discrimination oppose a study of discrimination against women in the public sector.

Look at the fact. While women comprise 46 percent of the Federal work force, about half; 85.5 percent of them are concentrated in just the lower 8 of all civil service job classes, and make 63 percent of what their male counterparts earn. Some in this body would have us believe that this occurs because, and I quote: "Women have different motivational needs than men" And I quote: "Men work longer hours than women."

Well, Senator Fulbright once said, "We are handicapped by policies based on old myths rather than current realities." Let us look at the myths and the realities.

Myth 1: Implementing Federal pay equity will bankrupt the Government.

Fact: In Minnesota, we successfully implemented full pay equity for State employees at a cost equivalent to just 1 percent of the State's annual payroll over 4 years. Others have done it for less.

Myth 2: Pay equity discriminates against men.

Fact: Minnesota implemented pay equity with no reductions, no freezes in salaries for male-dominated jobs, and so have others.

Myth 3: Pay equity undermines collective bargaining in seniority.

Fact: Minnesota made all of the salary adjustments within the framework of collective bargaining, and so have others.

I was one of the chief authors of the landmark law in Minnesota, and I assure you that the myths swirling around like gooey slop are wholly refuted by the real life experience in Minnesota.

In fact, the pay equity system was so successful for the State work force that the Minnesota Legislature, in 1984, extended pay equity to local governments as well.

The Minnesota Commissioner of Employee Relations testified before the subcommittee:

Our experience demonstrates that all the terrible things that might happen do not

happen when, in fact, you institute a pay equity program.

And we are just talking about a study.

□ 1810

If you want the truth about pay equity, look to Minnesota and over 100 other governments around America where the system is working. Don't be deceived by fabricated, biased rhetoric from those who pay lip service to equality, those who say, "I'm for equal pay for equal work, but . . ." They simply want to preserve the economic stake in the current system of discrimination.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding this time, and I rise in opposition to this bill.

I would like to talk about what comparable worth means and does not mean. Comparable worth means paying women and men the same, even though they are doing different work. It does not mean paying women and men the same for doing the same or substantially the same work or work of equal effort, skill and responsibility, because that is already required by the Federal law, the Equal Pay Act of 1973, which covers all employment.

It does not mean paying women and men the same for doing different work if women are denied employment in better paying jobs, because title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits any discrimination in employment because of sex.

There are no women's jobs or men's jobs.

It does mean paying women more than they now earn in certain jobs which comparable worth advocates claim are not paid as much as employers should pay because they are jobs done mostly by women.

It does mean that women who work should earn more, because it is not fair that, on average, women who work are paid less than men who work. How much less depends upon who is talking. The League of Women Voters, in a recent bulletin, said women are paid only 63 cents for every dollar earned by men. It also reports that black women are paid even less, 58 cents, and Hispanic women less again, 53 cents for every dollar paid to men.

I draw the conclusion from that study that means black and Hispanic women earn less than white women.

Perhaps the best way for each of us to evaluate comparable worth is to look at the work force with which we are now most familiar and see how we think it would work. If you are an employer, including Members of Congress, with a staff and committee responsibilities, how do you think the

average earnings of all women and men employees compare? If they are not about equal, would that mean sex discrimination? What jobs would you compare with what? What intrinsic value would you assign the individual jobs or classes of jobs, and how would you translate that intrinsic value into money? What would be fair?

I urge a vote against any comparable worth or pay equity legislation proposed in the name of protecting women against sex discrimination in Federal employment. Unless you plan or intend to pass a law requiring that half of all Federal employees in all grades be women, there is nothing more to legislate about.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of this legislation.

A few minutes ago, someone made mention of it as H.R. 3008, and we could not help but smile at that when we were sitting on the other side of the aisle, saying that it sounded almost like some kind of a spy number. Actually, there is no spying going on here. All we are talking about is a study. Everybody knows what we mean by a study. A study is something that we are going to look into a matter to see what actually does exist. That is something that I think is very much needed. There is no question in my mind, for example, that there are some very definite pay inequities within the Federal Government system, its overall system.

For example, I have never worked for the Federal Government but I have worked for governments in my life, except for working for the Federal Government now, and even at that time I found that very often people who are doing the same identical jobs, let alone those that are very comparable, but the same identical jobs, were being paid all kinds of different salaries. One person might be a GS-5, who had the same amount of longevity on the job, who was in an identical position, but because that person was black or because that person was a woman, another person would be paid only as a GS-4. Promotions are not given on an equal and same sound basis. So there is no question about there being inequities.

It seems to me that this Government, which is in fact a most democratic system of government in the world, ought to be applauding legislation such as this. We should not just now, as a matter of fact, in 1985, be talking about this legislation. We should have done it a long time ago. We should have had a study and this Government should be operating on a very fair, equitable basis for all of its employees.

It is my belief that a government such as ours owes it to itself, owes it to the citizens of this country to feel proud of itself, to say that yes, indeed, we are equitable in our pay system for our entire Government and all the jobs that we have to do.

A final point: I was very happy that a Member on the other side of the aisle mentioned about black women getting less money than perhaps some of the men. Now, black people period get less pay when it comes down to equity in Federal Government than all the rest of those employees who happen to be working for our Government.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBEY].

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to relate a North Carolina experience. Recently our distinguished Governor, Jim Martin, and a former very respected Member of this body, testified before the Civil Service Subcommittee and shared what happened in North Carolina. In North Carolina, in 1984, the general assembly passed legislation directing a pay equity study be conducted and authorized \$650,000 for the effort. Once they realized the broad implications of the comparable worth doctrine, they came back this year and, after careful deliberation, in April, our Legislature overwhelmingly, with a bipartisan vote, terminated this comparative worth study. I think this body should know that.

I include this letter in the RECORD at this point:

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Raleigh, NC, July 25, 1985.

HON. WILLIAM COBEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR BILL: As you know, I recently had the opportunity to testify before the Civil Service Subcommittee of the United States Senate on North Carolina's experience with respect to the controversial subject of comparable worth, or pay equity as proponents call it. Since the House of Representatives may soon consider a comparable worth bill on the floor, I thought it might be worthwhile for me to share with you the reasons why North Carolina rejected a similar type of pay equity "study" of its own State employees.

In June 1984, the North Carolina General Assembly passed legislation directing that a pay equity study be conducted, and authorizing \$650,000 for this effort. Although named a "pay equity" study, the impetus for ratifying this provision came from a Report by a State Task Force on Comparable Worth. This report recommended the development of an equitable job evaluation and pay system that would establish the comparable worth of State jobs on the basis of a point factor system.

Similar to the pending House bill pertaining to the federal workforce, our legislation directed, among other things, the creation of a "Pay Equity Advisory Committee"; that the Study encompass all of the State's clas-

sified employees' that a consultant be hired to conduct the Study; and that the consultant examine certain dissimilar State jobs based on a point factor comparison. In December 1984 the State hired a consultant to conduct the Study.

From the beginning, it was apparent that it would be difficult to successfully complete the Study. Problems evolved into two categories: problems with the logistics of Study itself, and more importantly, problems and concerns from a broad range of citizens on the basic comparable worth doctrine.

It was these broader concerns on the comparable worth doctrine and its implications that ultimately proved the most convincing. Foremost was the concern that there was no way of accurately estimating what the cost of salary adjustments, if any, might be. And, if the completed study recommended adjustments beyond the ability of the State to pay, then we might have directed ourselves into a situation similar to the State of Washington, where a study was commissioned, but the results not acted upon, after which a federal court somehow concluded that the study itself was invested with the power to compel its advice to be implemented. Second was the concern that comparable worth introduces an artificiality into wages and salaries, at odds with market rates. Finally, there was significant concern expressed that the move by the State toward comparable worth signalled an eventual requirement that the doctrine be forced upon private enterprise, in lieu of our traditional supply and demand approach to setting wages.

When the State legislature reconvened in February of this year, it began a careful reevaluation of the Study requirement. After careful deliberation, in April the legislature, by an overwhelming bipartisan vote, terminated the comparable worth Study.

We are now making what we believe to be better efforts to pay our employees fairly and equitably to trying to improve our existing classification system, and developing an improved way of providing pay incentives to those employees who are better performers. We believe this is the way to provide the opportunities our employees are looking for.

Best personal wishes.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. MARTIN.

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I want to say that I am for fairness, I am for strongly enforcing existing laws. When I was the athletic director at the University of North Carolina, before I left the job I made sure that there were 13 women's sports and 13 men's sports.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 20 seconds to the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3008, and I urge my colleagues to also support this bill. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I come from an entirely different perspective.

On November 15, 1984, I was one of only 2 women Members who spoke and voted against the equal rights amendment. It wasn't easy—it was one of the most difficult positions I've had to take as a Member of this body. But it was my strong conviction then, and it is now, that an equal rights amendment should be abortion neutral as well as

neutral on other vital social values. I feel that I represent the overall sentiment of my district and the majority of women in this country who want equal rights legislation that corrects discrimination but does not destroy the protections which this Nation has developed to preserve the institution of the family.

Now, by and large, most people who oppose the equal rights amendment express the classic view—"I want women to have equal pay for equal work. I want women to have equal advantages. I just don't want this ERA."

This philosophy is real, alive, justified and thriving. Nevertheless, discrimination against women in the workplace does exist. It is often overlooked and as yet unaddressed.

To underline this, I'd like to read a portion of a letter I recently received from one of my constituents who typifies so many women in our society. "I am an educated, professional employment counselor with 20 years experience in the work force. I am presently managing a temporary employment agency. I have full responsibility for marketing, interviewing, job placements, plus general office duties such as typing, filing, telephone, payroll, billing and computer operations. My salary is the same amount that my 19-year-old son earns as a gas station attendant."

So it seems very strange indeed to me that no Member of this body would advocate unequal pay for equal work, yet would oppose this legislation. This bill authorizes a study of Federal (not private or public sector) but a Federal study of pay equity that includes all compensation including job content and market factors to determine if Federal pay practices are fair and commensurate.

This study is long overdue. The standards used for the present Federal classification—were developed 62 years ago and have never since been reviewed for discrimination.

I applaud the dedicated women who choose to stay at home and do without money for the extras we now deem essentials, a new color TV, a VCR or an extra vacation. The sacrifices of these homemakers is rewarded in nonmonetary ways. But the cold grim fact is that more and more women must work for their families to survive. Statistics show that over 50 percent of all women work outside the home—not just for the pleasure of it. Many women work to provide shoes for their children's feet, to pay for ever rising house and energy payments, medical bills and feed their families.

On behalf of these women, I urge my colleagues to think with their heart as well as their intellect and support this legislation that merely calls for a study of the equity of Federal pay practices. For just a second, put yourself in the place of the millions of

women who are the breadwinners for their families—and are coming home with half a loaf.

If you said you don't support ERA—but you support equal opportunity for women, this is an opportunity to prove it.

□ 1820

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHUMWAY].

Mr. SHUMWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, during the years that it has been my privilege to serve in this body, I have seen us time and again take an idea that may be unpopular, may be unable to stand on its own merits, and package that idea in a very attractive setting, give it a very appealing title, and bring it to this floor and run it through this legislative process, and I think we are doing just that here today.

We have a bill that has some very insidious aspects to it. It has been put in a very attractive package. We have been told that it is only a study; that it only applies to Federal employees; that it is not comparable worth, that it is something more nicely called "Pay Equity." Something which has been given a very high-sounding title, "The Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985."

No doubt there will be many Members in this Chamber who will come in and vote for this bill because it sounds good, it looks good. But if it were more appropriately packaged and titled, perhaps the title being something like "The Anti-Free Enterprise Act of 1985," I wonder how many Members would be inclined to vote for it, and I wonder how many Members would feel like they had done their duty to their country when they go home tonight after a long day.

Mr. Chairman, this bill represents bad policy for America; it represents bad law if it is enacted. It represents a step backward for the women of this country. Frankly, I resent those inferences that have been made by prior speakers that those of us who very much believe and sincerely want to see equality for men and women in this country, somehow are not telling the truth when we say we oppose this bill because we do not see this as the means for bringing about that kind of equality.

Mr. Chairman, we have laws on the books that are designed to get at the very discrimination that so many speakers have spoken about this afternoon, and certainly those laws need to be enforced. They need to be applied. I, as one Member of this body, would very much support that kind of application. There is nothing wrong with the Equal Pay Act of 1963 as a vehicle for reaching this kind of discrimina-

tion. There is nothing wrong with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as a vehicle for addressing discrimination, and certainly we need to enforce those laws.

For us to adopt this bill today, we are going to make a gross departure from the free enterprise system which has always been the hallmark of the economy of this great country, a radical intrusion on that system, and one which I think is going to penalize those women of this country who have worked so hard within their job setting and now have made it as corporate officers, as responsible job holders throughout the marketplace.

We are also going to give a slap in the face to the thousands of women who are working hard to achieve equality of opportunity in that marketplace and in the job sector.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this bill does not represent free enterprise, and it does not represent the American way. I hope it is defeated.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

Mr. GARCIA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to congratulate my colleague from the State of Ohio who has chaired this through committee and to the floor. I would just like to say to my colleagues who are here, and I listened to the debate very carefully, and in the 45 seconds that I have left, this is 1985. It is not 1930 or 1940; it is 1985. Some of you may sit back and say, "You remember the good old days when it was just the one breadwinner who used to bring the bacon home and deliver the food for the house and pay the rent?"

In 1985 we are living in such a society where in most cases you have two breadwinners. Where you need that extra paycheck, and all my colleague from Ohio is asking for is a study. I cannot understand why this matter is so complex. Let us do it; let us study, and then let us come back. But remember: This is 1985.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. MONSON].

Mr. MONSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that we try and paint people into corners and make them appear less than what they really are.

If we are only talking about equal pay or pay equity we don't need a study. It doesn't take a study to determine if someone is being paid less than someone else for doing the same work. You just have to look at the numbers. A wage gap does not mean that women or minorities receive less for doing the same job. In fact, existing law already prohibits employers from doing that. It also ignores seniority, merit, or other legitimate factors that may con-

tribute to a gap. Besides the Bureau of Labor Statistics already show wage gaps are narrowing.

Jobs do not have an intrinsic or absolute value. Therefore you cannot assign a measurable economic worth on a scientific and pragmatically determined basis between different jobs. Market value principles is the only valid means of making these judgments.

The alternatives are to ensure that women and minorities have equal access to all jobs. This also must include equal access to education, training programs, and other elements that lead to higher paying jobs. This access is already assured by existing laws.

Let's not start trying to apply unjustifiable methods of comparing different jobs in the name of protecting rights. The costs are too high, the results only divisive. If someone is not being paid equally to another there are simple administrative solutions. A new study will not improve on that at all. Let's defeat H.R. 3008.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mrs. BOGGS].

Mrs. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3008, and I am in such good company when I do so. This bill passed out of committee 18 to 4. A similar bill passed this House last year, with only six nay votes against it. Forty-five States, including my own of Louisiana, have undertaken similar studies. Those who should know the most intimately about the need for its passage, the federally employed women, and international, bipartisan membership organization that represents the concerns of over 800,000 women employed by the Federal Government have this to say about urging its passage:

"A wage differential between male and female workers exists in the Federal work force." Federally employed women can expect to earn 63 percent of wages of all men. A large portion of this wage gap can be directly attributed to the occupational segregation within the Federal workplace.

Although women comprise nearly half of the workers of the general schedule classification system, 73 percent of all women are in GS grades 1 through 8. This occupational segregation directly results in lower wages for women. The average salary for Federal women workers in the GS system is \$18,864 per year as compared to \$30,229 per year for men.

The General Accounting Office [GAO] recently released a report entitled, "Options for Conducting a Pay Equity Study by the Federal Pay and Classification System." This report illustrates how the Federal classification system can be studied for sex-biased wage discrimination. The Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of

1985, H.R. 3008, would utilize the suggestions contained in the GAO study by providing for a study of the Federal wage and classification systems to determine if they are affected by discrimination based on sex, race, and hispanic origin. "The study would evaluate civil service jobs using both job content and economic analyses and would be conducted by a private consultant hired by a bipartisan commission."

This simple, straightforward—and just—legislation aims to accomplish a study to ensure that our civil service wage and classification systems are free of bias.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned about the cost of government, and I find this bill singularly silent on the potential cost of implementing the so-called study required in the bill. I am sure that this study is not undertaken with any expectation other than that it will justify a massive increase in the payroll cost in these classified positions.

Why then is there nothing about these potential costs in the bill? There is a great deal of rhetoric about protecting civil rights and precluding discrimination. There seems to be no consideration of the civil rights of the class which never gets a break. Who sees to the civil rights of the taxpaying citizen? Who protects the woman who must pay for social experiments in wage and price controls with taxes which could better be used to take care of her needs and those of her family?

Just this week two Members of this body sent out a letter on this bill and the experience in their home State of Washington with this suit resulting from a study mandated by their legislature. One of them says that the cost of conforming to that decision would be only a few million. The other claimed the cost as more than a half billion dollars. That allegation included some chilling numbers. The cost was estimated as one-eighth of the State's annual general fund budget. The effect would be that, in order to pay for that one judgment, every tax in the State's arsenal would have to be raised 12.5 percent a year. We simply cannot be so indifferent to the damage we do to the taxpayers as to ignore such a massive potential cost to them. If the State of Washington is in jeopardy for a half billion dollars, what might the Federal cost add up to.

I urge you to strip the mask of secrecy from this move to change our economic system and at least find out the immediate dollar cost.

□ 1830

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND].

Mr. LELAND. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am here on behalf of myself and the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, in support of H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act. Our colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio, is to be commended for once again coming forward with legislation to examine wage discrimination against women in the Federal sector. With H.R. 3008, she has gone a bold step further, showing the foresight and intestinal fortitude—to also include a study of wage discrimination based on race. This is a valiant step and certainly one that needs to be taken.

Contrary to what some of our colleagues and others are saying about this legislation, it would provide for a study to determine if, and to what extent, job classification and wages are affected by sex, race, or ethnicity. It is curious to me that so many people are concerned about the future threat of lawsuits that might result if racial or sexual discrimination is found. It seems to me that they fear the study will find such discrimination, and they just don't want their fears confirmed in black and white. You see, they're aware of the statistics: While accounting for nearly 50 percent of the Federal work force, approximately 78 percent of female employees are in grades 1-6, while 85 percent of men are in grades 10-15. Likewise, they are aware of the results of these statistics: Black and white women in the Federal work force earn only 62 cents and 63 cents, respectively, for every dollar earned by their white, male counterparts. It is clear from this that at the very least, the Federal Government is not the role model it should be. I want to know if this disparity is based on race or sex. If it is, not only is it morally wrong, but it is illegal and must be changed.

It is sad that 20 years after passage of the Civil Rights Act, which mandated equality for all Americans regardless of race or sex, we are still concerned with economic racism and bigotry that continue to keep women and racial minorities at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder. However, with H.R. 3008, this body has a chance to take a giant step in furtherance of the ideal of equality for all Americans, regardless of race or sex. Earlier today, this body showed compassion, intelligence and a firm belief in the principles upon which this Nation was founded and voted favorably on anti-apartheid legislation. I am asking my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to call upon those same qualities once more today and support H.R. 3008.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE].

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from North Carolina previously reviewed with Members what occurred in the North Carolina Legislature in 1983. I was a member of that body. I voted against the appropriation of \$650,000 to conduct a study on this very issue.

Something did not ring true, it seemed to me, at that time that that was the proper vehicle. As my colleague told members, this past session of our legislature repealed that appropriation because they concluded, as well, that it was not the proper vehicle.

It is my belief, Mr. Chairman, that this is the inappropriate forum to address this problem. It needs to be addressed, but it needs to be addressed and resolved in the marketplace.

I urge my colleagues to vote accordingly when it comes time.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman. I rise in strong support of the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985. The Federal Compensation System, which sets the wages for the largest employer in the country, was established in 1923. Since 1923, employment patterns and family structures in this country have changed dramatically. The Federal Compensation System has not. As a matter of fact, there has never been a thorough study of the Federal civil service to determine if the changes in employment have been reflected in the Federal Compensation System. A comprehensive wage study is long overdue.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] for her extensive examination of our Nation's pay system conducted as Chair of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits. It is through her diligence and persistence that we are able to consider this good, sound piece of legislation today. This initiative, The Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985, which would establish a temporary study commission, has over 100 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, and has been endorsed by numerous labor unions and organizations representing millions of this country's working population.

Pay equity is not a new concept. On the contrary, all but five States have initiated activity to study their pay systems. Sixteen States are conducting or have completed pay equity studies. And in some instances on both the State and local levels, employee contracts have been renegotiated with an

eye toward eliminating discriminatory factors.

In my home State of New York, an extensive study negotiated by the Civil Service Employees Association, AFSCME, and the State's Office of Employee Relations, is near completion. This 2 year project has focused on the practices of three bargaining units covering approximately 100,000 State employees.

There are a number of reasons why a valid comparison is possible between New York's initiative and the one we are considering today. New York State, as the third largest public employer in the country, is the largest jurisdiction to conduct such a job evaluation. The New York study, like the Federal proposal, has not focused strictly on instances of sex discrimination, but racial discrimination as well. Additionally, New York State hiring practices had also never been assessed to determine whether assumptions about jobs and the assignment of job titles to salary grade had been distorted by the sex or race of the typical job incumbent.

It is clear from the preliminary results of New York's job content survey that a pay equity study can be successfully carried out in a large public jurisdiction with a diverse work force. And, it is worth noting that many of the recommendations offered by those conducting the New York State study have been included in this bill.

From the amount of serious debate and activity pay equity has received in recent years, it is evident that discrimination has managed to creep into numerous pay systems. A recent General Accounting Office study reported that women, while comprising nearly half of the Federal work force, are clustered at the lower end of the pay scale. Approximately 78 percent of women are clustered in grades 1 to 6, earning an average of \$9,000 a year less than their male counterparts. Conversely, 85 percent of the male employees in the Federal Government occupy jobs in grades 10 to 15. According to Census Bureau data, women employed by the Federal Government earn an average of 62.8 percent of the wages of their male counterparts.

Many argue that the setting of wages can only be fairly determined in the marketplace. While wage setting cannot be divorced from the forces of supply and demand. It is also true that patterns exist in which certain jobs have historically been closed or open to particular persons on the basis of race and sex. The National Academy of Sciences estimates that at least 50 percent of wage discrepancy is due to discrimination. Job discrimination is a historic reality.

Opponents of pay equity also argue that the pay gap will close with the entrance of more women into less tra-

ditional, higher paying jobs. It is estimated, however, that this will not happen before the end of this century. Obviously this does not provide a solution for those who are in the workforce today.

Women have taken jobs that were available to them, but did not choose to earn lower pay. There is no justification to continue to pay women less for the work that they do or to expect them to change careers. More importantly, society cannot afford to sacrifice the work that women are now doing.

Changes in the structure of the American family have greatly altered the roles that women play in our society. The number of female-headed families grew by 1 million between 1979 and 1983. It is expected that by 1990 one child in four will live in a single parent household.

Hearings held recently by the Subcommittee on International Relations and Human Resources, which I chair, detailed the dramatic rise in the numbers of women and children in poverty. Today about half of female-headed families live below the federally determined poverty level.

In light of the startling and increasing rate of poverty among single parent families, nonenforcement of existing sex discrimination laws by the Federal Government is inexcusable. And it is truly distressing for the chairman of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission to pronounce that married male breadwinners are entitled to higher wages on the ground that "you have to give some kind of respect to traditional family values."

It is the job of the Federal Government to set an example for the country by properly following and enforcing existing labor laws. Today's bill will not change the existing laws or add new ones. Rather, the Commission will study Federal pay and classification systems with regard to title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

As the laws have already been determined, voluntary study and compliance at the Federal level will save the Government costly and time consuming law suits. Instead of ignoring or restructuring the procedure for handling the tremendous backlog of law suits which have already been filed, the Government will have the opportunity to operate as a fair and unbiased employer. The only affect this study hopes to have on State and local entities and the private sector will be to show that the Federal Government, too, is concerned with discrepancies in the existing wage system and is willing to make necessary corrections.

Last year, this body voted overwhelmingly in favor of pay equity legislation. That proposal, which was in fact stronger than the one we are considering today, passed by a vote of 413

to 6. It is my hope that, with the swift passage of H.R. 3008, we can get on with the effort to secure equality in the workplace.

A thorough examination of the Federal pay and classification system is long overdue. I believe that the legislation we are considering today outlines an objective and reasonable approach for reviewing this system, and for making recommendations where necessary. I urge that the House approve H.R. 3008 without substantive and weakening amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] that he has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues have time and again said, "Why do you object to a study?" We certainly do not object to a study. There have been 22 studies of Federal pay and classifications since 1949.

There was a study completed just this last year, the equal worth, comparable work and market worth of Federal jobs, a study of the Federal Government's pay classification and qualification systems for employment, by the United States Office of Personnel Management.

It depends on whether or not one likes the study. The gentlewoman from Ohio, as I understand it, asked the GAO to make a comparison of this with what it was intended to do, to find out if it was a competent study, and based upon the guidelines, as I understand it, of her request, they said it did not qualify as a competent study.

It depends on one's point of view. I think it is a good study. It is a very comprehensive study. But let us look at the reasons why we are concerned about the study that the gentlewoman is talking about in this piece of legislation.

A similar study was taken in the State of Washington which resulted in a \$1.1-billion judgment. We have 30 times as many employees as the State of Washington. If we have a judgment rendered of the magnitude that was rendered in the State of Washington, we are going to be looking at a \$30-billion judgment, \$30 billion.

There have been a number of States that have had studies of this type that have pending litigation—the State of Alaska, the State of California, the State of Connecticut, the State of Hawaii, the State of Illinois, the State of Michigan, the States of Missouri, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Washington. I want to tell my colleagues that according to the Justice Department, if this legislation is passed, they are absolutely certain

that there will be a similar suit filed against the Federal Government which could amount to as much as \$30 billion or more.

My colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, a few moments ago, indicated that in his State it only cost them 4 percent of the State budget in order to come up with a pay equity agreement. Four percent of the Federal payroll—

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I do not have time. I am very sorry.

Mr. SIKORSKI. I did not say 4 percent of the State budget, and I resent the gentleman saying that.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Four percent of the State payroll.

Mr. SIKORSKI. Will the gentleman yield so I can set the record straight?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It was 4 percent of the State payroll. But 4 percent of the Federal payroll, if we use that percentage, is \$2.4 billion. We are in a budget crunch right now. We have been arguing for the past few days over whether or not we are going to get a budget.

If we follow his train of thought and we come up with a 4-percent solution, we are looking at at least \$2.4 billion added to the Federal deficit, which is something I do not think we can tolerate right now.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this legislation is misguided and I am very hopeful that I am able to convince my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to consider the substitute which I will offer later in the debate on this legislation, which will really study this issue in depth, and if they want another study, I think this study will accomplish the goals that they are seeking.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio, the chair of the committee, for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of this legislation. I am interested to hear that this legislation may undermine the economic system of our Nation, may undermine the free enterprise system of our Nation, and may subject us to litigation.

First of all, if it does that, it seems to imply that there is something very much amiss, and the arguments that were used were clearly arguments used in almost every instance where progress was made in fairness to employees. Whether it was labor legislation, equal opportunity legislation, whatever it was, the arguments that we hear on this floor today have historically been used to keep people in

their place. In this case, it is women to be kept in their place.

If we are not doing anything wrong in Federal personnel policy, we have nothing to fear from a study which will give us the facts.

So I urge my colleagues to strongly support this legislation when it comes to a vote.

Currently, 47 million women are employed in the United States. Of these, a record 19.5 million are working mothers. That translates into 6 out of 10 women with children under 18 years old that are working. Fourteen years ago, 6 out of 10 stayed home. These working mothers are not part-time workers—a full 71 percent work full time.

Yet the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported in May that the median weekly earnings of women were 66 percent those of men. Women earned \$268 at the median while men earned \$404.

More importantly—among major occupational groups, women are separated from men by an unexplainable chasm in earned wages.

Men employed in executive, administrative, and managerial occupations had median earnings at \$601 compared with \$363 for women. Among professional specialty workers, men earned \$554 while women earned \$400.

These statistics go on and on. They reflect a strong likelihood of a structural inequity in our Nation's wage system. Unfortunately, our Federal wage system is not immune from this potentiality. Similar gaps in wages exist for Federal workers. Average male salary—\$30,229; average salary for women was \$18,864 in October 1983.

We cannot merely assume away the possibility that such wage gaps are the result of discrimination in violation of the Civil Rights Act. We owe it to ourselves and our employees to be certain of the reasons for such wage differentials. There has never been a full and complete study of the Federal Pay and Classification Systems since its inception in 1983.

It is time we had one. H.R. 3008 meets this need by mandating a study of the Federal Pay and Classification Systems to determine whether they are affected by discrimination based on sex, race, or Hispanic origin.

Only Federal jobs will be studied and recommendations are limited solely to Federal Civil Service. This bill does not put into place a national employment-pay equity policy for the country or even the Federal Government. Nor, does this bill presume that any existing wage gap is due to discriminatory practices. It only requires a complete study of our pay and classification system.

Congresswoman OAKAR deserves to be commended for her efforts to secure a fair and reasoned approach to

this study. Her bill establishes an 11 member bipartisan commission to oversee this study which will guarantee representation by both Houses of Congress, the President and the Office of Personnel Management. This commission will hire a consultant to perform an 18-month study, comment on the study and disband.

In this way, we will be provided with a complete and accurate review of the wage gap which exists between sexes in Federal employment and whether that gap is attributable to such factors as responsibility, effort, qualifications, seniority, education or other factors exclusive of sex, race, and ethnicity. We can then move forward based on data and not heresy.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Congresswoman OAKAR for her continued leadership in this field of pay equity. We should know if our Federal Civil Service is stained with discrimination and should quickly move to be certain that we are in full compliance with our civil rights laws. Equality and fair treatment must continue to be our goals to ensure a fair employment system supported by the high morale and productivity of all employees.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 3008.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to a very distinguished Member of Congress, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] who has been supportive of this legislation in every instance.

Mrs. KENNELLY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing—and certainly that would be one's impression listening to the opponents of the Federal Equitable Pay Practice Act.

To hear them talk, you would think that a little knowledge about Federal wage differentials and pay practices would whip up the winds of universal economic disaster, if not cause the immediate collapse of Western civilization. It just isn't so.

Rarely have we seen so much exaggeration and misinformation generated about one piece of legislation particularly one that was adopted in committee by a lopsided vote of 18 to 4, and which passed the House in a somewhat different form only a year ago with just six votes in opposition.

We don't often have to spend so much time saying what a bill does not do, but let me reiterate just two of the things this one does not do.

First, it does not send out an army of Federal bureaucrats to impose a standardized wage scale or mandatory pay increases on private American businesses. In fact, the bill applies only to the Federal work force, and it does not even impose any sort of pay system on them.

The bill provides for a study, a simple study, which would investigate whether sex, race, or Hispanic origin are factors used in setting pay. H.R. 3008 specifically requires that the study not assume that discrimination exists on those grounds. It requires that there be an investigation of all the ingredients which are used in setting pay, including seniority, merit, job content, and market forces.

Second, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act does not set up an irresponsible or biased Commission to oversee this study. If the Commission is stacked, it is in favor of the Office of Personnel Management: 5 of the 11 members on the Commission are either the Director of OPM or OPM appointees. The other six members are the Comptroller General of the United States and individuals appointed by the President and the majority and minority leaders of the House and Senate.

The Federal pay and employment classification system now in place has not been reviewed in a comprehensive manner since it was first established over 60 years ago. Yet preliminary information indicates that the average earnings gap between men and women working in the Federal Government is \$9,000 a year. Eighty percent of the women are concentrated in grade 7 and below, while 85 percent of the men in the Federal work force are concentrated in grades 10 through 15. Maybe sex discrimination plays absolutely no part in these enormous discrepancies, but it is high time we found out what does play a role.

It has been said that what you don't know won't hurt you. Perhaps Members of Congress won't be hurt by self-imposed ignorance on the subject of equitable pay practices. But the women and minorities and people of Hispanic origin who work for the Federal Government might be hurt with every paycheck if we refuse to accept our responsibility to know why inequities exist in Federal pay practices. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act rule.

□ 1840

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3008. As a former trade unionist, in that capacity before being elected to this great body, I negotiated and fought and picketed for pay equity in the private sector of our society. I can do no less as a Member of this Congress as a matter of conviction and commitment.

Usually it is a situation where people readily accept the appointment of

commissions and designations of studies for these kinds of issues as a method of depth for this kind of action which is being requested. This is a mild resolution, a mild bill, and certainly I believe this bill, H.R. 3008, outlines a thoroughly objective and reasonable approach to review our pay classifications for our employees.

Mr. Chairman, as Members of Congress we have an obligation to fight discrimination wherever it may exist. We need not fear or should not fear a study of the Federal Government pay and classification system. I certainly support this bill.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985. I commend my distinguished colleague, MARY ROSE OAKAR, Secretary of the House Democratic Caucus, for persevering on this issue and reintroducing this excellent bill. There has been a lot of discussion of this measure, and a lot of claims concerning its intent and consequences. Let's understand what this bill does and does not do.

First, let's look at what it does not do.

This bill does not propose any new law whatever, or any new standards for equitable pay. It simply proposes a study to determine whether the Federal pay and classification systems are consistent with current law—with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

It does not affect State or local government or private employers in any way. The bill proposes a study of the Federal Government only. It seeks to ensure that the Federal Government's own house is in order, that its own pay and classification systems are designed and enforced in accordance with current law and are not discriminatory.

The bill does not impose, directly or indirectly, any new Federal regulations on the private sector. Yet even job evaluations in the private sector do not require or lead to regulation of the market. Pay scales can reflect the market and be nondiscriminatory. Many large companies already have job evaluation systems to ensure that their job and wage systems do not violate Federal antidiscrimination laws. They obviously don't consider themselves to be tampering with the market.

Even though perfect objectivity obviously is impossible, the study proposed by the bill is not impossible to achieve. It is possible to identify and correct discriminatory pay practices. Forty-five States have already examined the issue, through studies, legislation, or collective bargaining. The GAO has conducted a study of the

methodologies the proposed Commission would use, and concluded that such a study is indeed feasible and that the study "would provide Congress with a comprehensive analysis of the pay equity issue."

The bill does not presume, nor will the Commission presume, that wage differentials are discriminatory. After the study, wage differentials unexplained by economic and job content analysis may be deemed discriminatory. This would be left to the judgment of the bipartisan, representative commission.

The bill does not provide for or mandate implementation of the Commission's recommendations, although I would hope that, if wage discrimination in the Federal Government were found, it would be eliminated.

The bill does not open the way for extensive, costly litigation. Should discriminatory practices exist in the Federal pay or classification systems, this study would enable the Government to take steps to end them promptly, thus avoiding possible litigation.

Finally, this bill does not threaten our way of life with extinction. Opponents of the bill predict that it will cause the "destruction of our economic strength," the "death of our free enterprise system," "loss of individual liberty," and "social chaos." Similar dire predictions were made when the Equal Pay Act, the minimum wage, and the child labor laws were enacted. Our free market system is strong and is only strengthened by laws embodying the American ideal of equality, such as H.R. 3008.

Now, let's take a look at what this bill does.

H.R. 3008 does demonstrate the Federal Government's commitment to our civil rights laws and to the elimination of wage discrimination.

It is crucial that American women and minorities have economic equity and an equal chance for economic self-sufficiency. Greater economic opportunity for all means greater long-term economic growth. From the standpoints of both productivity and simple justice, women and minorities must not be second class economic citizens. Our economy and our integrity cannot afford it.

The Federal Government is the Nation's largest employer, and probably its most visible employer. It also represents the beliefs and values of the American people. Surely it is incumbent upon us to see that our employment practices are scrupulously legal, and nondiscriminatory.

The bill does represent a broad, nonpartisan consensus that the time has come to look at the employment practices of the Federal Government. Last Congress, a similar bill passed the House with 413 votes. This year's bill has broad, bipartisan cosponsorship.

Opponents of this bill say that the rectification of discriminatory job and wage practices will be too expensive. Mr. Speaker, discrimination isn't a cost to be factored into a cost-benefit analysis, nor is its eradication. Discrimination is a moral outrage and a violation of the law, and its eradication is a moral obligation and a legal necessity.

I really believe that we all agree, proponents and opponents of the bill alike, that our goal in this area is a "gender-blind," "race-blind" society in which all individuals have equal opportunity to compete in our economic system. And I think we all agree that we have made a great deal of progress in eliminating barriers to equal economic opportunity. But we have not reached our goal yet, and we disagree on how to reach it. Opponents of the bill tell us that if we resolve to stop discriminating in the future, the market will take care of inequities. I agree with my friend Congresswoman OAKAR, and my colleagues who joined me in cosponsoring H.R. 3008, that this is not enough. Yes, we must look to the future, but we cannot ignore the past. While this bill only calls for a study, we cannot just ignore remaining, present discrimination created by past economic, social, and legal conditions and hope that it will go away. If people have been wrongfully placed at a disadvantage in our competitive economic system, we must seek out these inequities and remedy them. Only then will we have an economic system we can be proud of as Americans. H.R. 3008 recognizes our obligation, as Federal legislators, to look to our Federal wage and classification systems, to ensure that no Federal employee is at a wrongful economic disadvantage.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard much misinformation on the floor today by those who oppose the bill. They would have us believe that there are going to be all kinds of lawsuits because of this study on how we treat our classified Federal employees.

They mentioned the State of Washington. The reason the people succeeded in that case was because the Federal judge ruled they were discriminated against under the Civil Rights Act, title 7. It was not because of a study that that was done.

Forty-five States have either implemented a study or are in the process of implementing a study, and somehow the Sun is still shining and the rivers in this country are still flowing. That kind of fear tactic should not dissuade the Members.

This is a simple study. We have not done one since 1923. No one is trying to set up a national pay scale. I would be opposed to that. I believe very strongly in the free enterprise system.

But we do have jurisdiction over how we treat classified Federal employees, and we know we have not looked at how we classify them in a fair manner and an equitable manner since 1923. We also know we have not looked at how we classify not only women but minorities, and this is why we added minorities to this study.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who really believes that more than half of the population ought to be treated fairly in this country will support this legislation. Anyone who believes that Hispanic men and black men ought to be treated fairly will support this legislation. I ask my colleagues not to be swayed by the fears that people will give them. It is very interesting to me that those fears exist and have existed when we have addressed practically every piece of civil rights legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] has expired.

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise today in opposition to equal pay for equal work, and I do not rise in opposition to efforts to eliminate sex-based wage discrimination, wherever it may exist; I do rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3008, a bill proponents suggest will merely require a study of Federal employment practices, and particularly to the hasty manner in which it has been—being—rushed to the floor for consideration by the full House.

Now much has been said about this bill and the confusing and controversial theory of comparable worth it pretends not to advocate. At the risk of repeating some of the valid concerns that have already been raised by many of my distinguished colleagues, I would like to share one of my own.

H.R. 3008 represents an "end run" effort by its proponents to pass legislation that would set the stage for converting the theory of comparable worth into public policy. Now they aren't exactly calling it comparable worth. They realize that there is some resistance in Congress to what at present is nothing more than a theory that has no agreed upon meaning or definition. Instead, they call it pay equity, and who could be against equal pay for equal work? After all, isn't that the law? Isn't that what pay equity means? Well, at one time it did, but apparently not any more. Now we hear it defined as "equal pay for work of equal value"—or in other words, comparable worth. Sound confusing? It sure does.

Proponents will argue: Now wait a minute. H.R. 3008 only calls for a study. We're only suggesting that someone should take a look at the Federal pay and classification system, to see if any sex-based wage discrimination is taking place. That's all.

Again, it sounds innocent enough: just a study. In reality, the advocates

of comparable worth are trying to accomplish through the courts what they have not been able to accomplish through the legislative process: the implementation of comparable worth as public policy. They are fully aware of the recent experience of the State of Washington. It, too, commissioned "only a study," but what it got was a court decision sustaining a lawsuit which accused the State of practicing sex-based wage discrimination, based on the comparable worth theory. Proponents know full well that if the so-called pay equity study mandated by H.R. 3008 finds any discrepancies in wage compensation between male and female Government employees working at similar jobs—which would be, according to this bill, evidence of discrimination—it would lay the legal groundwork for filing the same type of lawsuits against the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, let's be up front about it. H.R. 3008 is a comparable worth bill. It is based on the comparable worth theory. Therefore, passage of H.R. 3008 would be interpreted as a congressional endorsement of comparable worth. I urge my colleagues to reject comparable worth. Vote "no" on H.R. 3008.

● Mr. MOODY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3008, the pay equity bill introduced by my colleague, Congresswoman MARY ROSE OAKAR.

There is no denying that this has become a controversial issue—even more surprising because of last year's support for a similar measure in this House. Can it be that we have turned our backs on wage discrimination and equality for woman and men?

Those of you who say no, and yet do not plan to vote for H.R. 3008, how can you deny a Federal study to resolve the most pressing questions about this issue?

Despite all the controversy, over 100 States and cities have undertaken studies of their wage scales, and in some cases have made changes in response to the discovered imbalance in pay. Nor has this been limited to the public sector. In 1984, the Rand Corp. found that, on average, women in the national work force are paid 64 cents for every \$1 paid to men—an appalling discrepancy. In my own State of Wisconsin, we have conducted a study of the salary structure of State employee to determine whether wage inequities exist between comparable jobs, and our neighboring State of Minnesota is successfully implementing a pay equity plan approved for the State in 1982.

As representatives to our Federal Government, we should be leading the way on this issue. The controversy surrounding it affects all of us as workers as employers who must deal with wage structures and job evaluation, and as

taxpayers and consumers who must feed our families.

I urge your support for this important study—we have nothing to fear from the facts if our intentions are workable.●

● Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, equal pay for equal work. No one can argue with that concept, and in fact, it has been the law of the land in America for many years.

We Americans are firmly on record as being against discrimination of all kinds. We have passed laws, and our courts have ruled on numerous occasions that discrimination of any kind will not be tolerated.

Now, many of you may have heard of comparable worth, a theory of job evaluation being touted in Congress as a cure-all for sex-based wage discrimination. It sounds good, but it could very well cause far more problems than it seeks to resolve.

Comparable worth would allow the Government, the courts, and boards of "experts" to mandate wage adjustments to equalize the pay of men and women in different occupations that are judged to be comparable in skill and responsibility.

If you're wondering how the Government—or anybody else—can determine the worth of a job better than the free marketplace, the answer is it can't. Comparable worth prevents economic freedom; it flies in the face of the laws of supply and demand. In sum, comparable worth ignores the role of competition, individual experience, and merit when determining the "worth" of a job.

Most comparable worth advocates prefer a white-collar evaluation system like the Factor Evaluation System, which the Federal Government used in a recent comparable worth study of Federal employees. In short, the study completely refutes the validity of using comparable worth theories for eliminating discrimination.

Indeed, the study showed that imposing such a pay system could cause a class war. It could set blue collar people against white collar people, rich against poor, employees against employers, men against women.

Consider these conclusions of the Government's study:

Custodial worker men and laundry worker women would be cut from \$16,000 to about a \$10,000 clerical worth.

Food service worker women and laborer men would get a \$5,000 pay cut relative to clerk-typist women.

Storeworker women and forklift operator men would receive at least \$4,000 less relative to nursing assistant women.

Sewing machine operator women and warehouse worker men would re-

ceive about \$3,000 less compared to women secretaries.

Comparable worth would not only fail to eliminate sex-based wage discrimination, but it would probably worsen the problem. By offering higher wages for what feminists call dead end jobs, comparable worth would diminish the incentive for a worker in a female-dominated occupation to vault the barriers into a previously male-dominated job. After all, why push to be a chemist when you can remain a clerical supervisor and make just as much or more money?

As a result, our society would be riddled with more sex-segregated jobs than ever before—and the bureaucracy necessary to cope with this maze of regulation would become incredibly huge.

Women, the very people that comparable worth advocates purport to help, seem to recognize the folly of this job evaluation method. In a nationwide survey of 2,704 adult Americans conducted late last year, only 18 percent of all female respondents favored the passage of new laws as a means of combatting sex-based wage discrimination.

Certainly we should continue to work to eliminate discrimination of all kinds, and particularly wage discrimination against women.

What women truly want, and what they should rightfully receive, is better enforcement of the two equal pay laws that are already on the books. Proper enforcement of two statutes—the Equal Pay Act and title VII—guarantees equal pay for equal work to all workers, and that's as it should be.

Equal pay for equal work is the American way. But a federally arbitrated comparable worth board is not the way to go.●

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985, sponsored by my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Congresswoman MARY ROSE OAKAR, chair of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important, fair, and long overdue legislation which authorizes an 18-month study of the Federal pay and job classification systems to determine whether they are administered and operated in a manner consistent with current law, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, race, and ethnicity.

The Federal Government, the Nation's largest employer, lags far behind the rest of the country in addressing the issue of pay equity. While the majority of States have already begun to examine their own pay systems and many are implementing corrective changes, it is incumbent upon us in the Congress to enact legislation that

will examine the relationship between antidiscrimination laws and Government pay practices.

It is past time for the Federal Government to begin to address the issue of pay equity. To those who argue that we will be endorsing comparable worth, I say you are wrong. Mandating this study will not be an endorsement of any policy other than fair pay practices in the Federal Government, a goal upon which we already agree. In passing H.R. 3008, the Congress would be upholding its responsibility to exercise public policy oversight.

H.R. 3008 is a well-crafted bill, seeking simply to provide us with an evaluation of our Federal pay practices. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985.●

● Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, today, the House of Representatives will take up H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985, and I am in wholehearted support of this measure to study the Federal Government's job classification and pay systems.

H.R. 3008 was reported out of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, with bipartisan support, on July 24, and since that time a barrage of information has flooded our offices opposing the intent of this legislation and the study. These red flags of caution and warning I contend are unwarranted. Are those in opposition to a study of the Federal work force afraid of what may be discovered?

Pay equity concept is evolving into an important issue of the 1980's. As an issue of this decade, pay equity is not a new or innovative idea of our times. At an International Labor Organization Conference held in Rome in 1951, 80 nations passed a resolution supporting comparable worth. Additionally, more than 100 comparable worth/pay equity initiatives now exist at various governmental levels around the country. Six States have implemented comparable worth/pay equity policies, and other States are in the process of studying their State's pay classification and compensation systems. I contend now is the appropriate time for the Federal Government to review its classification and wage systems to determine if ethnic origin, gender, or race are elements used in setting pay scales in the Federal work force.

H.R. 3008 establishes a bipartisan Commission on Equitable Pay Practices to oversee a study conducted by an independent, private consultant on the Federal classification and wages. The study will take into consideration positions of classified employees of the Federal Government, it will not affect local or State public sector employees or the private sector work force.

H.R. 3008 offers important technical revisions that were not included in H.R. 5680, which was passed by the

House last year. The revisions include a March 1985 GAO recommendation on how to conduct a pay equity study by expanding the study to determine if economic variables such as education, locality, merit, productivity, seniority, veterans status, and work experience are associated with occupational pay differentials. Economic analysis joined with job content analysis will provide for a well-rounded approach to the study.

The questions asked by this legislation, and determined by a careful study are legitimate. An undertaking of this nature will essentially provide the administration and Congress with information and recommendations to determine if Federal pay practices are consistent with section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Federal classification and pay systems were established by the Classification Act of 1923, and since that time there has not been a general review of the system. I believe now is an appropriate time to address this matter. It would be rather naive to think that some Federal positions have not become institutionalized, over the years, by a particular gender or race. Let's not push aside a factfinding study of the classification and wage systems and an opportunity to improve the Federal Government as a responsible and fair employer.

The Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985 is a laudable piece of legislation to assist the administration and Congress in identifying, and if need be address, any forms of discrimination that may exist within the Federal pay system. I strongly urge my colleagues to seriously consider favorably H.R. 3008.●

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I was a cosponsor of the predecessor bill to H.R. 3008, H.R. 27. I signed on to that early bill not as an ardent supporter of the concept of comparable worth, but as one who is concerned about some of the allegations of inequities in our Federal pay scales. I felt that the sponsor's suggestion that a study be made of the Federal pay and classification system to determine whether there are inequities was a good idea.

Unfortunately, opponents of the comparable worth idea have unfairly represented this bill as something far more extensive than it is. The study will examine the Federal Government only—it will not translate to the private sector in any way. The bill does not implement the findings of the study.

There have been many comments by some of our colleagues in the past few weeks which have attempted to explain why there may be disparities that are perfectly normal which account for the fact that 78 percent of federally employed women are concen-

trated in the low end of the pay scale. They raise some good points, but, if true, I believe the points will be confirmed in the study as well.

Other opposition to the bill centers around the fact that a costly court case could arise from any failure of the Federal Government to implement recommendations included in the pay study. Or that the court would determine that the study's recommendations must be implemented by the Federal Government. The bill, H.R. 3008, does say that. I guess I have more faith in the courts than that.

I have many questions about the feasibility of developing a rating system or another method to determine a fair system of comparable worth. In general, I want most decision to be made in the market place. However, I do not have any objection to a bill which appears only to study the Federal pay system for possible inequities. In my opinion, the issue has been blown way out of proportion.●

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in favor in H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985, which calls for a study of the Federal pay and classification systems to determine whether they are marred by sex-based wage discrimination.

As the largest single employer in the nation the Federal Government should be a model of legal compliance for all. But we are behind in this area. To date all but five States have examined the issue of sex-based wage discrimination.

We can not ignore the evidence that the Federal pay and classification systems may be biased. A GAO report showed a pay differential of almost \$12,000 between male and female Federal Government employees. The study pointed out that women are clustered into relatively few occupations near the lower end of the pay scale while men are predominantly found in jobs with higher grades.

This legislation before us today is not revolutionary. It is not a nationwide comparable worth program. This bill was reported out of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee by a vote of 18-4. A similar bill passed the House of Representatives last year by a vote of 413-6. This legislation merely reaffirms the law of the land, which states that sex, race and ethnicity are not factors that may be used to determine the rate of pay for any person or any position.

We can eliminate discrimination in our time, but we can not do so if we deny that it exists or if we refuse to join in the effort to determine the extent of the problem.

Support of H.R. 3008 is support for a fair, objective study of discrimination in the pay practices of the Federal civil service. The public has a right to

know if the wage practices of its Government are within the law.●

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend my colleague from Ohio, chair of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits, and a fellow member of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, for her work on the issue of pay equity.

The legislation before us today, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985, mandates a study on the Federal pay and classification systems to determine whether they are affected by discrimination based on sex, race or ethnicity. The current system for so-called white collar workers, the General Schedule, appears to evaluate positions in a fashion that comports with the principles of gender equity and pay equivalence. Variations in pay and class/grade determination are based on differences in the difficulty, responsibility and qualification requirements for the work performed. In addition, determining factors include the amount of supervision required and the amount of independent judgment which is necessary. These criteria would appear to discount discriminatory factors. However, I believe it is important to look at the system to ensure that, in fact, they do.

The prevailing rate system, which covers what are traditionally referred to as "blue collar" positions, applies to those in trades or crafts, or in skilled, semiskilled, or skilled manual labor occupations. Clearly, these are fields where there traditionally has been little female participation. In addition, the prevailing rate system provides that wages must be maintained in line with prevailing wages for comparable work in the private sector within a local wage area. The question will be how to deal with disparities in the two systems while accounting for factors unique to each.

The issue of pay equity, or "comparable worth," is complex. Women's roles in society have changed dramatically, particularly in the last two decades. I think it is important to note that achieving full equality for women is a multi-faceted process. Those of us who have taken a lead in this effort are attempting to address all aspects of the issue through studies and proposed reforms in pension and tax laws, education, child care and civil rights. All of these subjects contribute to the complexity of the pay equity issue, and how they are dealt with at present and in the coming years will have a lot to do with progress toward pay equity.

This legislation takes an appropriate first step in addressing comparable worth questions. It is only a study, which will allow us to determine from its results what our next step should be. It takes into account the recommendations of the General Accounting Office [GAO] for conducting such a

study. It will include job content analysis, based on factors such as skill, effort, responsibility and qualifications. Further, it will also contain an economic analysis, to show the extent to which differences in pay may be attributed to factors such as merit, seniority, work experience and locality.

Eliminating discrimination is a complex and difficult task. It is slow and tedious. It required acceptance of the fact that most problems in society are not the subject of a simple cause and effect relationship. But it must continue to remain high on our agenda. Indeed, "comparable worth" is an issue worth looking at.●

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985. I commend my distinguished colleague, MARY ROSE OAKAR, Secretary of the House Democratic caucus, for persevering on this issue and reintroducing this excellent bill. There has been a lot of discussion of this measure, and a lot of claims concerning its intent and consequences. Let's understand what this bill does and does not do.

First, let's look at what it does.

H.R. 3008 does demonstrate the Federal Government's commitment to our civil rights laws and to the elimination of wage discrimination.

It is crucial that American women and minorities have economic equity and an equal chance for economic self-sufficiency. From the standpoints of both productivity and simple justice, women and minorities must not be second-class economic citizens.

Greater economic opportunity for all means greater long-term economic growth. As an economy, as a society, we cannot afford the tragic waste of human potential, human skill and knowledge, that occurs when we deprive women and minorities parity in the work force.

But just as important, as a nation great in both economic and moral strength, we cannot afford to deprive American citizens of an equal opportunity to develop their potential and contribute to their society to the full extent of their ability, without artificial and discriminatory economic disadvantages.

Mr. Chairman, I have two young daughters—two energetic and talented daughters. I am concerned for their future, as any father would be. I want my daughters to be able to go where their talents and their determination lead them. As a father proud of his daughters, as an American proud of his country, I do not want my daughters to have to struggle against discrimination. I want no woman, no member of a minority group, no American citizen, to have to struggle against discrimination.

We must not place women or minorities at an unfair and illegal economic disadvantage. Our economy and our integrity cannot afford it.

The Federal Government is the Nation's largest employer, and probably its most visible employer. It also represents the beliefs and values of the American people. Surely it is incumbent upon us to see that our employment practices are scrupulously legal, and nondiscriminatory.

The bill does represent a broad, non-partisan consensus that the time has come to look at the employment practices of the Federal Government. Last Congress, a similar bill passed the House with 413 votes. This year's bill has broad, bipartisan cosponsorship.

Opponents of this bill say that the rectification of discriminatory job and wage practices will be too expensive. Mr. Chairman, discrimination isn't a cost to be factored into a cost-benefit analysis, nor is its eradication. Discrimination is a moral outrage and a violation of the law, and its eradication is a moral obligation and a legal necessity.

I really believe that we all agree, proponents and opponents of the bill alike, that our goal in this area is a "gender-blind," "race-blind" society in which all individuals have equal opportunity to compete in our economic system. And I think we all agree that we have made a great deal of progress in eliminating barriers to equal economic opportunity. But we have not reached our goal yet, and we disagree on how to reach it. Opponents of the bill tell us that if we resolve to stop discriminating in the future, the market will take care of inequities. I agree with my friend Congresswoman OAKAR, and my colleagues who joined me in cosponsoring H.R. 3008, that this is not enough. Yes, we must look to the future, but we cannot ignore the past. We cannot just ignore remaining, present discrimination created by past economic, social, and legal conditions and hope that it will go away. If people have been wrongfully placed at a disadvantage in our competitive economic system, we must seek out these inequities and remedy them. Only then will we have an economic system we can be proud of as Americans.

H.R. 3008 recognizes our obligation, as Federal legislators, to look to our federal wage and classification systems, to ensure that no Federal employee is at a wrongful economic disadvantage.

Now, let's look at what this bill does not do.

This bill does not propose any new law whatever, or any new standards for equitable pay. It simply proposes a study to determine whether the Federal pay and classification systems are consistent with current law—with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and

section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

It does not affect State or local government or private employers in any way. The bill proposes a study of the Federal Government only. It seeks to ensure that the Federal Government's own house is in order, that its own pay and classification systems are designed and enforced in accordance with current law and are not discriminatory.

The bill does not impose, directly or indirectly, any new Federal regulations on the private sector. Yet even job evaluations in the private sector do not require or lead to regulation of the market. Pay scales can reflect the market and be non-discriminatory. Many large companies already have job evaluation systems to ensure that their job and wage systems do not violate Federal antidiscrimination laws. They obviously don't consider themselves to be tampering with the market.

Even though perfect objectivity obviously is impossible, the study proposed by the bill is not impossible to achieve. It is possible to identify and correct discriminatory pay practices. Forty-five States have already examined the issue, through studies, legislation, or collective bargaining. The GAO has conducted a study of the methodologies the proposed Commission would use, and concluded that such a study is indeed feasible and that the study "would provide Congress with a comprehensive analysis of the pay equity issue."

The bill does not presume, nor will the Commission presume, that wage differentials are discriminatory. After the study, wage differentials unexplained by economic and job content analysis may be deemed discriminatory. This would be left to the judgment of the bipartisan, representative Commission.

The bill does not provide for or mandate implementation of the Commission's recommendations, although I would hope that, if wage discrimination in the Federal Government were found, it would be eliminated.

The bill does not open the way for extensive, costly litigation. Should discriminatory practices exist in the Federal pay or classification systems, this study would enable the Government to take steps to end them promptly, thus avoiding possible litigation.

Finally, contrary to some claims, this bill does not threaten our way of life with extinction. Opponents of the bill predict that it will cause the "destruction of our economic strength," the "death of our free enterprise system," "loss of individual liberty," and "social chaos." Similar dire predictions were made when the Equal Pay Act, the minimum wage, and the child labor laws were enacted.

Our free market system is strong and is only strengthened by measures

embodying the American ideal of equality, such as H.R. 3008.●

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985.

H.R. 3008 mandates a study of the Federal pay and classifications systems for discrimination based on sex, race, and ethnicity.

As the Federal wage and classifications system has never been studied for evidence of discrimination, I believe that the study mandated by H.R. 3008 is clearly warranted. Indeed, as our labor market has certainly changed dramatically over the past several generations, it is important to clarify whether or not this vital system is organized in the most equitable and fair manner possible.

Pay equity simply means that wages and classifications are based on skill, effort, responsibility, and the working conditions of an occupation. It requires that jobs not be evaluated on the basis of sex or race.

The Government Accounting Office has issued a report that makes recommendations as to how a pay equity study might best be conducted. H.R. 3008 will take these into consideration in providing Congress with a comprehensive analysis of the situation.

This is an important study, indeed, an important step toward a better understanding of where discrimination might exist in our Federal wage and classification system, and what we might do to correct it.●

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985, a proposed 18-month study to determine whether our Federal pay and classification systems are affected by discrimination based upon sex, race or ethnicity.

As a government, we pride ourselves on being part of a nation which places great importance on fairness and equity. As a nation we have come a long way to correct unfairness in our society, however, we still have a long way to go.

I want to commend our colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative MARY OAKAR, who has championed this bill which seeks to identify the problems of chronic pay inequities in the Federal Government, the Nation's largest employer, and thereby, move us closer to our goals of social and economic justice for all our citizens. It is my pleasure to be a cosponsor of this important legislation.

According to studies by the U.S. Census Bureau, and the General Accounting Office [GAO], the disparity between income of Federal employees who are male and female is an average of \$9,000.

A study prepared by the GAO revealed that federally employed women

earn an average of 62.8 cents for every dollar earned by males employed by the Federal Government. That data also demonstrated that black women working for the Federal Government earn an average of 62.2 cents for every dollar earned by a male. When we compare all sectors—Federal, State and local government, and private—white females earn 59.2 cents for every dollar paid to a male, black women earn 54.7, and Hispanic women earn 51.2 cents.

The GAO also examined the extent to which federally employed women are clustered into relatively few occupations at the lower end of the pay scale. They found that even though women comprise 44 percent of the Federal work force, approximately 78 percent of the female employees were clustered in grades 1 to 6. On the other hand, 85 percent of the male employees occupied jobs in grades 10 to 15.

The wage gap is a persistent problem, one which has remained fairly static since the mid-1950's, and will remain so unless corrections are made. Neither the free market nor antidiscrimination laws—as currently enforced—have made a dent in the gap. This situation has persisted in spite of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Equal Pay Act of 1963.

Mr. Chairman, there are some who ask: Why do we need such a study in 1985? The reason is clear: no study has ever examined this Federal concern since 1923 when the wage plan for paying the Nation's Federal civil servants was implemented. H.R. 3008 merely seeks to identify the cause of the problem. There are others who have expressed skepticism, arguing that the study is politically motivated. However, there is no need to fear the study because it is a bipartisan effort which had passed the House last year by a vote of 413 to 6.

This study focuses exclusively on the Federal Government. In addition, the 11-member bipartisan Commission which will oversee the study has only 18 months to make its final report, and 90 days after fulfilling its responsibilities, the Commission's authority will end.

All but five States have already addressed this issue. Some 39 have done research, while 22 are currently conducting evaluations of the pay classifications of State employees. In addition, seven States are implementing pay equity adjustments as a result of such studies. Many of these States, as well as some cities, have taken the lead in implementing pay equity policies to eliminate wage discrimination in their governments. Should not the Federal Government examine its own wage system, and follow the example being set by such States?

The mechanics of this legislation reflect national concern through a bi-

partisan team which will oversee the use of two types of research methods to be applied in this study as recommended by the GAO in its March 1984 study. One research method to be used, job content analysis, rates entry-level positions so that jobs are value based on factors such as skill, effort, responsibility, qualifications, and working conditions. To complement that technique, another method, economic analysis, will measure the extent to which pay differentials can be attributed to factors such as seniority, merit, productivity, education, work experience, veterans' status, locality, or other factors exclusive of sex, race, or ethnic origin.

The Congressional Budget Office [CBO] estimates that H.R. 3008, if enacted by September 1986, will cost between \$1.5 and \$2 million over the fiscal years 1986 and 1987. This bill specifies that the study is to be paid for with the regularly appropriated funds of the Office of Personnel Management. The GAO concluded that a pay equity study is feasible, and a study using both economic and job-content analyses would provide Congress with a comprehensive analysis of the pay equity issue.

This bill is not a back-door attempt to override market forces in determining wages for women and minorities. Rather, it is merely a means to determine if the Federal Government is adhering to existing antidiscrimination laws. Criticisms that this bill will severely disrupt the economy are only a repeat of false alarms sounded by those who announced a similar fate if the Equal Pay Act, minimum wage, and child labor laws were enacted.

In all those cases, the predicted economic chaos never came to pass. I believe that adoption of this legislation will be another important step in continuing the longstanding, bipartisan opposition to discrimination in this country.

After 60 years of experience with the Federal wage structure it is time for a comprehensive study which will give us the clarity to move the Nation forward. The Federal Government has the responsibility of developing, implementing, and enforcing legislation that will eliminate pay inequities based on race, sex, or ethnicity. Certainly it has a responsibility to make sure it is not discriminating as well. We can only bring honor to ourselves and the Nation by passing H.R. 3008 without further reservation, and I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation. ●

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill will be considered by sections, and each section shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 of the bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985".

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KILDEE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3008) to promote equitable pay practices and to eliminate discrimination within the Federal civil service, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST AND PROVIDING PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 32, FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1986

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-248) on the resolution (H. Res. 253) waiving points of order against and providing procedures for the consideration of the conference report (S. Con. Res. 32) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 and revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1985, or any amendment in disagreement thereto, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 32, FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1986

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 253 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 253

Resolved, That all points of order against the conference report on the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 and revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 1985, or against the consideration of the conference report or of any amendment reported from conference in disagreement, are hereby waived. The

conference report, or any amendment reported from conference in disagreement shall be considered as having been read when called up for consideration. If the conferees report in disagreement and the House acts first, it shall be in order to consider, without intervening motion, a motion, if offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, that the House recede from its amendment and concur with an amendment or amendments, such motion shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question, such motion shall be debatable for not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled as provided by clause 2(b) of rule XXVIII, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on such motion. If the Senate acts first and further amends the House amendment, it shall be in order in the House to consider, without intervening motion, a motion, if offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, that the House either concur in or disagree to the Senate amendment, such motion shall be debatable for not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled as provided by clause 2(b) of rule XXVIII, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on such motion.

SEC. 2. The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall have until September 6, 1985 to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD allocations of budget outlays, new budget authority, and new entitlement authority to committees, and said allocations shall be considered to be the allocations required to be printed in the joint statement of managers on Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344).

□ 1850

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes for purposes of debate only to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI]. Pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule waives points of order against and provides procedures for the consideration of the conference report to accompany Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1986, or any amendments reported in disagreement thereto. Before I discuss the provisions of this rule, Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that this rule was drafted in order to provide the House with a number of options, or contingencies, so that the Members of the House would be able to respond to action on this legislation in the other body.

As our colleagues may be aware, the conference committee on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1986 agreed to a budget resolution several hours ago. Upon conclusion of the conference, however, there remained some question as to the order and the form in which this agreement would be considered in each Chamber of Congress.

The Committee on Rules, therefore, was faced with the question of how best to ensure timely consideration of the agreement while not knowing at the time we were meeting precisely in what form the budget resolution would be considered. This rule, therefore, covers all potential contingencies as to which Chamber would consider the matter first, as well as the form in which the agreement might be considered in the House.

Subsequent to this rule being ordered reported, we have been advised that the House will consider this budget agreement before it is taken up in the other body, and that we will act on amendments in disagreement rather than on a conference report. Therefore, I will discuss only those provisions of this rule which are applicable to our current situation.

Quite simply, this rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against consideration of the conference report, and the amendment in disagreement will be considered as having been read.

This rule also makes in order a motion, without intervening motion, that the House recede and concur with an amendment or amendments. The motion would not be subject to a demand for a division of the question and would be debatable for 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by majority party and minority party as provided by clause 2(b) of rule XXVIII. The previous question on the motion would be considered as ordered.

Section 2 of this rule provides that the Chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. GRAY, has until September 6, 1985 to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD spending allocations which are deemed to be allocations required by section 302(a) of the Budget Act. This section of the Budget Act requires that committee spending allocations be included in the joint statement accompanying a conference report on any budget resolution. Because the budget agreement was reached only hours ago, the Budget Committee will need some time to provide accurate allocations. By providing that these allocations be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when we return in September, this provision will allow the Budget Committee sufficient time to accurately allocate the spending totals among the House committees.

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary for the House to waive points of order against this conference report if we are to have an opportunity to complete action on the first budget resolution prior to the start of the August district work period. As is often the case, conference committees have concluded action on very important legislature of pressing national interest within hours of a scheduled adjournment. The rule before the House at present is neces-

sary to facilitate the consideration of the budget resolution before adjournment. Moreover, this rule is similar to the rule adopted by the House earlier today, by voice vote, to provide for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act.

As our colleagues will recall, the House passed House Concurrent Resolution 152, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1986, on May 23. Diligent efforts have been underway since that time to produce a conference agreement on the first budget resolution. The House conferees on the first budget resolution, led by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and chairman of the House Budget Committee, Mr. GRAY, have worked tirelessly over the last several weeks to produce a conference agreement.

While we have worked consistently toward a conference agreement on the first budget resolution, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of the House have also made some very pragmatic and appropriate decisions about imposing the discipline of the Budget Act on this Chamber even without final adoption of a budget resolution, as well as providing for the orderly handling of the appropriations measures for the coming fiscal year.

With the start of this recess, Mr. Speaker, the House will have concluded action and adopted 8 of 13 general appropriation bills for fiscal year 1986. The consideration of these appropriation measures was greatly facilitated by House adoption of a measure reported from the Committee on Rules, House Resolution 231, a resolution providing special budget procedures for the fiscal year 1986 budget process.

House Resolution 231, which the House adopted on July 24th, had the very important effect of providing that the House-passed budget resolution would be considered final adoption of a budget resolution for fiscal year 1986, for purposes of the Budget Act provisions triggered by such action, until final adoption by the House and the Senate of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1986. Not only did this action facilitate the business of providing funds for the Government, but it also activated the provisions of the Budget Act which served to keep the spending provided in these appropriation measures within the limits that the House agreed to in its budget resolution.

Under the provisions of House Resolution 231, Mr. Speaker, upon adoption of the conference report to accompany Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 by the House and the Senate, the provisions of House Resolution 231 will cease to apply. Specifically, the House-passed budget will be replaced by the provisions of the conference report, once it is adopted in both

Chambers, as final adoption of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1986.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that some of our colleagues may be hesitant about supporting a rule that expedites consideration of this conference report. I would respond, however, that if this rule is not adopted, we will not have an opportunity to finalize the budget for fiscal year 1986 before adjournment. With the start of fiscal year 1986 on October 1, 1985, this is simply not a measure which we can delay.

As a member of both the Committee on Rules and the Budget Committee, as well as serving as a conferee on the budget resolution, I am acutely aware of the concerns of Members on both sides of the aisle that the Congress cannot continue to work on budgetary legislation for the next fiscal year without a budget resolution in place. I have shared these concerns. I believe we have reached a satisfactory conference agreement, and we must put it in force.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule, and subsequently, the conference report to accompany Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1986.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina, in my opinion, has more than adequately described this rule. I agree with his description.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am very disappointed that a separate vote was not allowed on function 050. It denies the House an opportunity which it has not had this year to determine whether or not they want a freeze in the budget. If this resolution replaces the House resolution that we adopted 2 weeks ago, it says we do not want to freeze the budget. It is disappointing to me that we were not given an opportunity for a separate vote, but I will make my arguments on the bill.

I just think it is a tragedy when this House is not having an opportunity to voice its will on function 050 when that is the only function that is going to be exceeded with regard to the freeze.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I would respond to the gentleman that the Speaker of the House this morning has stated that he will request of the Rules Committee a rule on the authorization bill that will allow the House to exercise its will on that particular matter.

□ 1900

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, having said that, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania submitted the followed conference report and statement on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32), setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988, and revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1985:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 249)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32), setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 and revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 1985, having met, after full and free conference, been unable to agree on a conference report because the conference decisions have changed certain budget figures outside the scope of the conference. As set forth in the accompanying Joint Explanatory Statement, the conferees do propose a congressional budget incorporated in a further amendment for the consideration of the two Houses.

WILLIAM H. GRAY III,
JIM WRIGHT,
THOMAS J. DOWNEY,
MIKE LOWRY,
BUTLER DERRICK,
VIC FAZIO,
GEO. MILLER,
MARTIN FROST,
DELBERT LATTI,
JACK KEMPS,
LYNN MARTIN,
BOBBI FIEDLER,
BEAU BOULTER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE V. DOMENICI,
WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG,
NANCY LONDON
KASSEBAUM,
RUDY BOSCHWITZ,
SLADE GORTON,
LAWTON CHILES,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
JIM SASSER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32), setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 and revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 1985, report that the conferees have been unable to agree. This is a technical disagreement, necessitated by the fact that in some instances the conference decisions include figures which (for purely technical reasons) would fall outside the range between the corresponding House and Senate provisions.

It is the intention of the conferees that the following amendment will be considered in the House and in the Senate.

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate submit the following joint statement in explanation of the action agreed upon by the managers:

The substitute language which is to be offered (and which should be considered the language of the concurrent resolution as recommended in the conference report for purposes of section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)—hereinafter in this statement referred to as the "conference substitute"—is as follows:

That the Congress hereby determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 is hereby revised and replaced, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1986 is hereby established, and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1987 and 1988 are hereby set forth.

(a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, October 1, 1986, and October 1, 1987:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$736,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: \$795,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$869,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$960,100,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$0.
Fiscal year 1986: \$3,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$5,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$7,600,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$44,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: \$50,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$56,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$61,200,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$186,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: \$200,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$216,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$248,000,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$1,062,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: \$1,069,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$1,137,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$1,216,450,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$946,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: \$967,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$1,024,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$1,073,000,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits in the budget which are appropriate in the light of economic conditions and all other relevant factors are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$209,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: \$171,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$154,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$112,900,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$1,847,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: \$2,078,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$2,301,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$2,507,000,000,000.

and the amounts by which the statutory limits on such debt should be accordingly increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$24,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: \$230,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$223,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$205,100,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, October 1, 1986, and October 1, 1987, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New direct loan obligations, \$52,850,000

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$69,350,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New direct loan obligations, \$34,400,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$80,150,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New direct loan obligations, \$32,150,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$79,050,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New direct loan obligations, \$31,400,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$84,000,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments, for fiscal years 1985 through 1988 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, \$292,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$249,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, \$302,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$267,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, \$323,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$285,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, \$346,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$303,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$10,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,850,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$12,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,600,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$12,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,450,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$12,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,050,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, \$900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,550,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$4,100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,850,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,150,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,950,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,450,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,750,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,150,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,950,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$13,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$5,700,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,550,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$13,600,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,400,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,250,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$5,600,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,750,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,900,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$6,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$26,900,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$5,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$28,200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,450,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$5,300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$29,900,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,850,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$5,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$31,700,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,850,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,750,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,950,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,050,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,850,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$8,800,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,550,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,850,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$9,000,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,350,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,350,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$9,400,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,950,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$9,600,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$250,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$250,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$250,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(12) Medical Insurance (570):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, \$72,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$65,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, \$81,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$69,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, \$90,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$76,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$94,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$84,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, \$164,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$128,900,000,000.

(C) New Direct loan obligation, \$14,300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, \$155,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$119,050,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$1,800,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, \$163,750,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$124,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,300,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$172,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$130,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$1,800,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$198,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$189,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$207,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$200,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$224,750,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$214,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$264,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$228,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$16,800,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,450,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$17,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,550,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,250,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,800,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,650,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$20,900,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,050,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,150,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,450,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,450,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (18) General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (850):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (19) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$129,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$129,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$142,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$142,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$152,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$152,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$155,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$155,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (20) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$2,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,650,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$2,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, —\$700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, —\$32,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$32,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, —\$39,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$39,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitment, \$0.

(E) New Secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, —\$37,100,100,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$37,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, —\$40,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$40,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

RECONCILIATION.

SEC. 2. (a) Not later than September 27, 1985, the committees named in subsections (b) through (z) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committees on the Budget of their respective Houses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committees on the budget shall report to the House and Senate a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SENATE COMMITTEES

(b) The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$0 in budget authority and \$1,250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$0 in budget authority and \$2,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$0 in budget authority and \$4,600,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(c) The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the

Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to achieve savings of \$0 in budget authority and \$100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$0 in budget authority and \$200,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$0 in budget authority and \$300,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(d) The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$2,374,000,000 in budget authority and \$2,814,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$2,828,000,000 in budget authority and \$3,685,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$2,998,000,000 in budget authority and \$3,821,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(e) The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$328,000,000 in budget authority and \$310,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$133,000,000 in budget authority and \$119,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$135,000,000 in budget authority and \$130,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(f) The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, or (3) any combination thereof, sufficient to achieve the following: savings of \$5,485,000,000 in budget authority and \$5,403,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, increases of \$291,000,000 in budget authority and \$147,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and savings of \$337,000,000 in budget authority and \$314,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(g) The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) by combination thereof, as follows: \$0 in budget authority and \$200,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$0 in budget authority and \$850,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$0 in budget authority and \$1,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(h)(1) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the

Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$0 in budget authority and \$3,307,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$0 in budget authority and \$7,951,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$0 in budget authority and \$10,908,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(2) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of the committee sufficient to increase revenues as follows: \$1,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; \$3,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and \$3,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(i) The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$0 in budget authority and \$3,219,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$0 in budget authority and \$4,421,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$0 in budget authority and \$4,986,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(j) The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$670,000,000 in budget authority and \$170,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$860,000,000 in budget authority and \$535,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$1,085,000,000 in budget authority and \$960,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(k) The Senate Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$448,000,000 in budget authority and \$509,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$564,000,000 in budget authority and \$972,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$1,060,000,000 in budget authority and \$998,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(1) The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and

outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$300,000,000 in budget authority and \$300,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$400,000,000 in budget authority and \$400,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$450,000,000 in budget authority and \$450,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(m) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce outlays by \$1,250,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce outlays by \$2,050,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce outlays by \$4,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(n) The House Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays by \$100,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce outlays by \$200,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce outlays by \$300,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(o) The House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$2,374,000,000 in budget authority and \$2,814,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986; \$2,828,000,000 in budget authority and \$3,685,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$2,998,000,000 in budget authority and \$3,821,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(p) The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$670,000,000 and outlays by \$470,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce budget authority by \$860,000,000 and outlays by \$835,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce budget authority by \$1,085,000,000 and outlays by \$1,260,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(q) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$1,513,000,000 in budget authority and \$3,947,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$1,246,000,000 in budget authority and \$5,008,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$1,401,000,000 in budget authority and \$6,512,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(r) The House Committee on Government Operations shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays by \$0 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce outlays by \$3,526,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce outlays by \$4,956,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(s) The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee

sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$4,000,000,000 and outlays by \$4,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to increase budget authority by \$1,504,000,000 and outlays by \$1,504,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to increase budget authority by \$1,029,000,000 and outlays by \$1,029,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(t) The House Committee on Judiciary shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$570,000,000 and outlays by \$70,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce budget authority by \$610,000,000 and outlays by \$285,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce budget authority by \$635,000,000 and outlays by \$510,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(u) The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$300,000,000 and outlays by \$300,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce budget authority by \$100,000,000 and outlays by \$100,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce budget authority by \$100,000,000 and outlays by \$100,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(v) The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$3,219,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$4,421,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$4,986,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(w) The House Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce outlays by \$200,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, to reduce outlays by \$850,000,000 in fiscal year 1987, and to reduce outlays by \$1,050,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(x) The House Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$448,000,000 in budget authority and \$509,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$564,000,000 in budget authority and \$972,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$1,060,000,000 in budget authority and \$998,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(y) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$300,000,000 and outlays by \$300,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce budget authority \$400,000,000 and outlays by \$400,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce budget authority by \$450,000,000 and outlays by \$450,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(z) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce the budget deficit by

\$5,027,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce the budget deficit by \$7,245,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce the budget deficit by \$9,362,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

AUTOMATIC SECOND BUDGET RESOLUTION

Sec. 3. (a) If the Congress has not completed action by October 1, 1985, on the concurrent resolution on the budget required to be reported under section 310(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for fiscal year 1986, then, for purposes of section 311 of such Act, this concurrent resolution shall be deemed to be the concurrent resolution required to be reported under section 310 of such Act.

(b) In the House of Representatives, section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as made applicable by subsection (a) of this section, shall not apply to bills, resolutions, or amendments within the jurisdiction of a committee, or any conference report on any such bill or resolution, if—

(1) the enactment of such bill or resolution as reported;

(2) the adoption and enactment of such amendment; or

(3) the enactment of such bill or resolution in the form recommended in such conference report;

would not cause the appropriate allocation for such committee of new discretionary budget authority or new spending authority as described in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 made pursuant to section 302(a) of such Act for fiscal year 1986 to be exceeded.

TAX REFORM

Sec. 4. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the existing tax structure of the United States distorts economic activity, leading to an inefficient use of national resources and a weakening of our domestic economic vitality and competitive posture in international markets;

(2) the relating tax burdens among various taxpayer categories are manifestly unfair insofar as they arise from differences in the capabilities of taxpayers to take advantage of complicated tax laws;

(3) the ability of the Federal Government to plan and conduct rational fiscal policy is frustrated by elaborate schemes to avoid taxation and the unintended effects of tax incentives and penalties;

(4) progressive erosion of voluntary compliance threatens the fiscal integrity of our public finances and the confidence of our citizens in the Federal Government's capacity to govern; and

(5) a number of plans, each designed to simplify and reform the Tax Code, have been before the Congress for a time sufficient to allow for extensive analysis and evaluation.

(b) It is therefore the sense of the Congress that tax reform should be adopted as soon as possible, and that it should incorporate the following principles and objectives:

(1) efficiency and responsiveness to market conditions in the economic activities of American businesses and consumers;

(2) simplicity of structure and lower marginal tax rates;

(3) a fair and equitable distribution of the tax burden among all taxpayers, with relief for those below the poverty level, and incentives to bring them into the work force;

(4) a broader tax base, with deductions essential to avoid genuine hardship or to protect the economic security of the American people; and

(5) increased incentives for work, saving, and investment.

CBO SCOREKEEPING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 5. It is the sense of the Senate that because the Senate requires timely reporting of legislative action on spending bills, and because the Senate requires continual control over the budget, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall issue a weekly report during periods when the Senate is in session detailing and tabulating the progress of congressional action on bills and resolutions providing new budget authority and changing revenues and the public debt for a fiscal year, including, but not limited to the requirements set forth in Public Law 93-344, section 308(b).

FARM LOSS DEDUCTION

SEC. 6. It is the sense of the Senate that revenues should be increased and it is assumed that tax legislation will be enacted to limit to the national median family income the amount of farm loss which may be deducted against nonfarm income, and it is further assumed that revenues derived from enactment of such legislation be used to reduce individual income tax rates and to assure that full-time, family-size farm operators will not be disadvantaged by unfair competition from high-income taxpayers with substantial nonfarm income.

ENHANCED TAX LAW ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 7. It is the sense of the Congress that revenues should be increased and it is assumed that the Committees on Finance and Ways and Means will develop legislation to reduce the tax enforcement gap, estimated by the Internal Revenue Service at \$92,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1986. It is further assumed that such legislation should provide for increased and improved enforcement and collection, through audits, examinations, and other steps designed to identify and eliminate tax cheating and increase revenue collections from individuals and corpo-

rations currently evading Federal taxes, and that the legislation should include steps designed to increase voluntary compliance with tax laws and that such steps may include increased staff for taxpayer assistance, speedier processing of returns and provision of public information designed to build public trust and understanding of Internal Revenue Service enforcement efforts and that such legislation should also provide that the resources of the Internal Revenue Service shall be increased to accomplish full enforcement of United States tax laws, increasing voluntary compliance.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY CONFERENCE

SEC. 8. It is the sense of the Congress that the Administration should consider convening a high level meeting of the major industrial countries for the express purpose of exploring options to improve the functioning of the international monetary system, including measures to stabilize currency exchange rates, reduce interest rates, promote maximum domestic and world economic growth, and help assure domestic price stability.

COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT'S PRIVATE SECTOR SURVEY ON COST CONTROL

SEC. 9. It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) each of its standing committees should review and study, on a continuing basis, those portions of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control affecting subjects within its jurisdiction;

(2) each of its standing committees should, in its consideration of any bill or joint resolution of a public character within its jurisdiction, review those portions of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control pertaining to such bill or resolution; and

(3) each report of any such committee on a bill or joint resolution of a public character should contain—

(A) an identification of each recommendation of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control implemented in such bill or resolution and the estimated dollar amount of program cost savings or revenue enhancement as a result of the implementation of each such recommendation; and

(B) a statement setting forth each recommendation of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control pertaining to such bill or resolution, the disposition of each such recommendation, and the reasons for such disposition.

LIMITATION ON BENEFITS TO ALIENS

SEC. 10. It is the sense of the Congress that functional totals should be reduced to reflect a limitation on the amount of social security benefits paid to illegal and nonresident aliens. It is assumed that the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee will report legislation to accomplish the required changes in law. Such legislation may limit benefits to the amount of wage-earner's contribution plus interest, unless the wage-earner is a citizen of a country with which the United States has a treaty or totalization agreement and that this provision would apply to individuals becoming eligible on or after January 1, 1986.

EXPLANATION OF CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

The following tables show the functional allocations and budget aggregates included in the conference substitute. The numbers in the fiscal year 1985 columns reflect revisions of the second budget resolution for fiscal year 1985. The fiscal year 1986 columns show the budget aggregates and functional allocations for the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1986. The columns for fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1988 show budget aggregates and functional allocations which the conferees consider appropriate for those years.

CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE, FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION, FISCAL YEAR 1986

(In billions of dollars)

| Function | Fiscal year 1985 | | Fiscal year 1986 | | Fiscal year 1987 | | Fiscal year 1988 | |
|--|------------------|----------|------------------|----------|------------------|----------|------------------|----------|
| | Budget authority | Outlay | Budget authority | Outlay | Budget authority | Outlay | Budget authority | Outlay |
| 050 National defense..... | 292.60 | 249.40 | 302.50 | 267.10 | 323.40 | 285.20 | 346.80 | 303.90 |
| 150 International Affairs..... | 24.70 | 17.20 | 21.30 | 18.85 | 20.10 | 17.30 | 19.90 | 16.45 |
| 250 General science and space..... | 9.10 | 8.70 | 9.10 | 8.90 | 9.05 | 8.90 | 9.30 | 9.00 |
| 270 Energy..... | 0.90 | 5.50 | 5.90 | 5.55 | 5.85 | 5.15 | 4.95 | 4.45 |
| 300 Natural resources..... | 13.10 | 13.00 | 13.10 | 13.00 | 13.20 | 12.75 | 13.15 | 12.95 |
| 350 Agriculture..... | 27.00 | 23.30 | 18.30 | 15.55 | 17.70 | 16.25 | 16.20 | 13.75 |
| 370 Commerce and housing credit..... | 12.60 | 5.50 | 7.70 | 3.70 | 7.70 | 3.45 | 7.85 | 3.20 |
| 400 Transportation..... | 29.40 | 26.00 | 26.85 | 25.80 | 28.90 | 27.70 | 29.75 | 28.10 |
| 450 Community and regional development..... | 8.30 | 8.40 | 6.95 | 8.05 | 6.90 | 7.30 | 7.20 | 6.85 |
| 500 Education, training, employment and social services..... | 32.10 | 30.40 | 31.55 | 30.85 | 32.35 | 31.35 | 32.95 | 32.10 |
| 550 Health..... | 33.60 | 33.50 | 36.00 | 34.90 | 38.40 | 37.80 | 41.10 | 40.70 |
| 570 Medical insurance..... | 72.00 | 65.90 | 81.50 | 69.20 | 90.60 | 76.40 | 94.20 | 84.90 |
| 600 Income security..... | 164.50 | 128.90 | 155.10 | 119.05 | 163.75 | 124.20 | 172.40 | 130.60 |
| 650 Social security..... | 198.70 | 189.00 | 207.20 | 200.80 | 224.75 | 214.00 | 264.60 | 228.10 |
| 700 Veterans benefits..... | 27.40 | 26.40 | 27.45 | 26.80 | 27.55 | 27.25 | 27.90 | 27.65 |
| 750 Administration of justice..... | 6.70 | 6.30 | 6.90 | 6.80 | 7.05 | 7.00 | 7.20 | 7.15 |
| 800 General government..... | 5.70 | 5.70 | 5.50 | 5.45 | 5.30 | 5.20 | 5.50 | 5.45 |
| 850 General purpose fiscal assistance..... | 6.40 | 6.40 | 6.50 | 6.50 | 2.00 | 3.20 | 2.10 | 2.10 |
| 900 Net interest..... | 129.20 | 129.20 | 142.30 | 142.30 | 152.50 | 152.50 | 155.00 | 155.00 |
| 920 Allowances..... | 0.50 | | -2.10 | -1.65 | -2.00 | -1.70 | -0.70 | -0.50 |
| 950 Undistributed offsetting receipts..... | -32.40 | -32.40 | -39.90 | -39.90 | -37.10 | -37.10 | -40.90 | -40.90 |
| Total spending..... | 1,062.10 | 946.30 | 1,069.70 | 967.60 | 1,137.95 | 1,024.10 | 1,216.45 | 1,073.00 |
| Revenues..... | | 736.50 | | 795.70 | | 869.40 | | 960.10 |
| Deficit..... | | 736.80 | | -171.90 | | -154.70 | | -112.90 |
| Debt subject to limit..... | | 1,847.80 | | 2,078.70 | | 2,301.90 | | 2,507.00 |
| Change in revenues..... | | | | 3.00 | | 5.10 | | 7.60 |
| Change in public debt limit..... | | 24.00 | | 230.90 | | 223.20 | | 205.10 |

FISCAL YEAR 1985 BUDGET AGGREGATES AND FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES

[In billions of dollars]

| | House passed | Senate passed | Conference agreement |
|--|--------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Budget authority..... | 1,039.10 | 1,055.60 | 1,062.10 |
| Outlays..... | 941.65 | 949.10 | 946.30 |
| Revenues..... | 736.05 | 736.20 | 736.50 |
| Deficit..... | 205.60 | 212.90 | 209.80 |
| Debt subject to limit..... | 1,857.40 | 1,849.30 | 1,847.80 |
| Change in revenues..... | | | |
| Change in public debt limit..... | 33.60 | 25.50 | 24.00 |
| FUNCTION | | | |
| 050 National defense: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 291.55 | 292.60 | 292.60 |
| Outlays..... | 252.00 | 252.00 | 249.40 |
| 150 International affairs: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 24.95 | 25.30 | 24.70 |
| Outlays..... | 17.50 | 18.00 | 17.20 |
| 250 General science, space and technology: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 9.10 | 9.10 | 9.10 |
| Outlays..... | 8.80 | 8.70 | 8.70 |
| 270 Energy: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | -2.90 | 1.60 | 0.90 |
| Outlays..... | 2.85 | 6.50 | 5.50 |
| 300 Natural resources and environment: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 13.00 | 12.70 | 13.10 |
| Outlays..... | 13.10 | 13.10 | 13.00 |
| 350 Agriculture: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 22.55 | 24.80 | 27.00 |
| Outlays..... | 18.95 | 21.00 | 23.30 |
| 370 Commerce and housing credit: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 6.60 | 12.60 | 12.60 |
| Outlays..... | 2.95 | 5.60 | 5.50 |
| 400 Transportation: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 29.35 | 29.60 | 29.40 |
| Outlays..... | 26.20 | 26.10 | 26.00 |
| 450 Community and regional development: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 6.80 | 8.40 | 8.30 |
| Outlays..... | 7.85 | 8.70 | 8.40 |
| 500 Education, training, employment and social services: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 32.65 | 31.60 | 32.10 |
| Outlays..... | 31.10 | 30.30 | 30.40 |
| 550 Health: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 33.55 | 33.60 | 33.60 |
| Outlays..... | 33.50 | 33.50 | 33.50 |
| 570 Medical insurance: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 71.75 | 71.80 | 72.00 |
| Outlays..... | 65.20 | 65.20 | 65.90 |
| 600 Income security: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 160.50 | 162.80 | 164.50 |
| Outlays..... | 129.25 | 128.60 | 128.90 |
| 650 Social security: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 195.50 | 195.50 | 198.70 |
| Outlays..... | 189.30 | 189.30 | 189.00 |
| 700 Veterans benefits and services: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 27.40 | 27.20 | 27.40 |
| Outlays..... | 26.50 | 26.30 | 26.40 |
| 750 Administration of justice: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 6.65 | 6.50 | 6.70 |
| Outlays..... | 6.45 | 6.40 | 6.30 |
| 800 General government: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 5.80 | 5.80 | 5.70 |
| Outlays..... | 5.85 | 5.80 | 5.70 |
| 850 General purpose fiscal assistance: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 6.40 | 6.40 | 6.40 |
| Outlays..... | 6.40 | 6.40 | 6.40 |
| 900 Net interest: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 129.95 | 129.70 | 129.20 |
| Outlays..... | 129.95 | 129.70 | 129.20 |
| 920 Allowances: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.50 |
| Outlays..... | 0.30 | 0.30 | |
| 950 Undistributed offsetting receipts: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | -32.35 | -32.40 | -32.40 |
| Outlays..... | -32.35 | -32.40 | -32.40 |

FISCAL YEAR 1986 BUDGET AGGREGATES AND FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES

[In billions of dollars]

| | House passed | Senate passed | Conference agreement |
|----------------------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Budget authority..... | 1,062.90 | 1,069.50 | 1,069.70 |
| Outlays..... | 967.25 | 965.00 | 967.60 |
| Revenues..... | 794.10 | 793.60 | 795.70 |
| Deficit..... | 173.15 | 171.40 | 171.90 |
| Debt subject to limit..... | 2,089.70 | 2,086.50 | 2,078.70 |
| Change in revenues..... | 1.45 | 0.90 | 3.00 |
| Change in public debt limit..... | 232.30 | 237.20 | 231.00 |

FISCAL YEAR 1986 BUDGET AGGREGATES AND FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

| | House passed | Senate passed | Conference agreement |
|--|--------------|---------------|----------------------|
| FUNCTION | | | |
| 050 National defense: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 292.60 | 302.50 | 302.50 |
| Outlays..... | 267.10 | 273.10 | 267.10 |
| 150 International affairs: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 21.75 | 21.20 | 21.30 |
| Outlays..... | 18.60 | 17.80 | 18.85 |
| 250 General science, space and technology: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 9.10 | 9.10 | 9.10 |
| Outlays..... | 8.90 | 9.00 | 8.90 |
| 279 Energy: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 6.10 | 5.20 | 5.90 |
| Outlays..... | 5.75 | 5.10 | 5.55 |
| 300 Natural resources and environment: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 13.10 | 12.20 | 13.10 |
| Outlays..... | 13.00 | 12.50 | 13.00 |
| 350 Agriculture: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 18.55 | 17.20 | 18.30 |
| Outlays..... | 15.80 | 14.50 | 15.55 |
| 370 Commerce and housing credit: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 8.85 | 6.80 | 7.70 |
| Outlays..... | 4.60 | 3.40 | 3.70 |
| 400 Transportation: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 28.40 | 27.20 | 26.85 |
| Outlays..... | 26.45 | 26.10 | 25.80 |
| 450 Community and regional development: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 7.55 | 6.60 | 6.95 |
| Outlays..... | 8.15 | 7.90 | 8.05 |
| 500 Education, training, employment and social services: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 32.05 | 30.10 | 31.55 |
| Outlays..... | 31.15 | 30.30 | 30.85 |
| 550 Health: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 36.10 | 35.70 | 36.00 |
| Outlays..... | 35.60 | 35.30 | 34.90 |
| 570 Medical insurance: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 81.95 | 81.90 | 18.50 |
| Outlays..... | 68.25 | 68.30 | 69.20 |
| 600 Income security: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 158.25 | 155.40 | 155.10 |
| Outlays..... | 121.75 | 116.60 | 119.05 |
| 650 Social security: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 207.20 | 207.40 | 207.20 |
| Outlays..... | 100.80 | 194.90 | 200.80 |
| 700 Veterans benefits and services: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 27.45 | 26.70 | 27.45 |
| Outlays..... | 26.80 | 26.10 | 26.80 |
| 750 Administration of justice: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 6.90 | 6.80 | 6.90 |
| Outlays..... | 6.80 | 6.70 | 6.80 |
| 800 General government: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 5.35 | 5.30 | 5.50 |
| Outlays..... | 5.30 | 5.20 | 5.45 |
| 850 General purpose fiscal assistance: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 5.35 | 6.50 | 6.50 |
| Outlays..... | 5.65 | 6.50 | 6.50 |
| 900 Net interest: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 140.95 | 142.39 | 142.30 |
| Outlays..... | 140.95 | 142.30 | 142.30 |
| 920 Allowances: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | -4.90 | -1.60 | -2.10 |
| Outlays..... | -4.40 | -1.60 | -1.65 |
| 950 Undistributed offsetting receipts: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | -39.75 | -35.00 | -39.90 |
| Outlays..... | -39.75 | -35.00 | -39.90 |

FISCAL YEAR 1987 BUDGET AGGREGATES AND FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

| | House passed | Senate passed | Conference agreement |
|--|--------------|---------------|----------------------|
| 150 International affairs: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 20.55 | 20.40 | 20.10 |
| Outlays..... | 16.90 | 17.10 | 17.30 |
| 250 General science, space and technology: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 9.05 | 9.00 | 9.05 |
| Outlays..... | 8.90 | 8.80 | 8.90 |
| 270 Energy: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 6.05 | 5.20 | 5.85 |
| Outlays..... | 5.35 | 4.60 | 5.15 |
| 300 Natural resources and environment: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 13.40 | 12.60 | 13.20 |
| Outlays..... | 12.80 | 12.40 | 12.75 |
| 350 Agriculture: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 17.95 | 17.70 | 17.70 |
| Outlays..... | 16.95 | 15.80 | 16.25 |
| 370 Commerce and housing credit: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 9.30 | 5.60 | 7.70 |
| Outlays..... | 5.00 | 2.30 | 3.45 |
| 400 Transportation: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 30.45 | 27.90 | 28.90 |
| Outlays..... | 28.95 | 27.70 | 27.70 |
| 450 Community and regional development: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 7.80 | 6.70 | 6.90 |
| Outlays..... | 8.05 | 7.10 | 7.30 |
| 500 Education, training, employment and social services: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 33.00 | 30.70 | 32.35 |
| Outlays..... | 32.10 | 29.90 | 31.35 |
| 550 Health: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 38.60 | 38.20 | 38.40 |
| Outlays..... | 38.30 | 37.80 | 37.80 |
| 570 Medical insurance: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 91.55 | 91.20 | 90.60 |
| Outlays..... | 75.55 | 74.80 | 76.40 |
| 600 Income security: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 167.40 | 164.90 | 163.75 |
| Outlays..... | 127.80 | 120.60 | 124.20 |
| 650 Social security: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 224.75 | 225.50 | 224.75 |
| Outlays..... | 214.05 | 205.90 | 214.00 |
| 700 Veterans benefits and services: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 27.65 | 26.80 | 27.55 |
| Outlays..... | 27.35 | 26.20 | 27.25 |
| 750 Administration of justice: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 7.05 | 6.90 | 7.05 |
| Outlays..... | 7.00 | 6.90 | 7.00 |
| 800 General government: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 5.30 | 5.40 | 5.30 |
| Outlays..... | 5.20 | 5.20 | 5.20 |
| 850 General purpose fiscal assistance: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 1.95 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Outlays..... | 2.90 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| 900 Net interest: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 150.95 | 152.10 | 152.50 |
| Outlays..... | 150.95 | 152.10 | 152.50 |
| 920 Allowances: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | -4.60 | -1.60 | -2.00 |
| Outlays..... | -4.25 | -1.60 | -1.70 |
| 950 Undistributed offsetting receipts: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | -36.55 | -37.80 | -37.10 |
| Outlays..... | -36.55 | -37.80 | -37.10 |

FISCAL YEAR 1988 BUDGET AGGREGATES AND FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES

[In billions of dollars]

| | House passed | Senate passed | Conference agreement |
|--|--------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Budget authority..... | 1,212.80 | 1,212.90 | 1,216.45 |
| Outlays..... | 1,080.00 | 1,060.20 | 1,073.00 |
| Revenues..... | 955.60 | 955.90 | 960.10 |
| Deficit..... | 124.40 | 104.30 | 112.90 |
| Debt subject to limit..... | 2,536.50 | 2,525.50 | 2,507.00 |
| Change in revenues..... | 3.10 | 3.40 | 7.60 |
| Change in public debt limit..... | 215.80 | 212.60 | 205.10 |
| FUNCTION | | | |
| 050 National defense: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 335.40 | 346.80 | 346.80 |
| Outlays..... | 303.90 | 313.00 | 303.90 |
| 150 International affairs: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 20.60 | 20.70 | 19.90 |
| Outlays..... | 16.20 | 16.70 | 16.45 |
| 250 General science, space and technology: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 9.10 | 9.30 | 9.30 |
| Outlays..... | 8.95 | 9.00 | 9.00 |

FISCAL YEAR 1988 BUDGET AGGREGATES AND FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

| | House passed | Senate passed | Conference agreement |
|--|--------------|---------------|----------------------|
| 270 Energy: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 5.15 | 4.90 | 4.95 |
| Outlays..... | 4.65 | 4.20 | 4.45 |
| 300 Natural resources and environment: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 13.65 | 12.80 | 13.15 |
| Outlays..... | 13.20 | 12.50 | 12.95 |
| 350 Agriculture: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 15.0 | 17.00 | 16.20 |
| Outlays..... | 15.00 | 12.90 | 13.75 |
| 370 Commerce and housing credit: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 9.50 | 6.10 | 7.85 |
| Outlays..... | 6.70 | 5.10 | 5.20 |
| 400 Transportation: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 31.30 | 27.30 | 29.75 |
| Outlays..... | 29.50 | 27.40 | 28.10 |
| 450 Community and regional development: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 8.10 | 7.10 | 7.20 |
| Outlays..... | 7.95 | 6.70 | 6.85 |
| 500 Education, training, employment and social services: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 33.70 | 31.30 | 32.95 |
| Outlays..... | 32.95 | 30.40 | 32.10 |
| 550 Health: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 41.15 | 40.80 | 41.10 |
| Outlays..... | 40.80 | 40.30 | 40.70 |
| 570 Medical insurance: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 95.55 | 94.80 | 94.20 |
| Outlays..... | 84.60 | 82.70 | 84.90 |
| 600 Income security: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 175.80 | 173.90 | 172.40 |
| Outlays..... | 133.85 | 125.70 | 130.60 |
| 650 Social security: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 264.65 | 266.10 | 264.60 |
| Outlays..... | 228.30 | 220.00 | 228.10 |
| 700 Veterans benefits and services: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 28.05 | 27.20 | 27.90 |
| Outlays..... | 27.80 | 26.70 | 27.65 |
| 750 Administration of justice: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 7.20 | 7.00 | 7.20 |
| Outlays..... | 7.15 | 7.00 | 7.15 |
| 800 General government: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 5.45 | 5.50 | 5.50 |
| Outlays..... | 5.45 | 5.50 | 5.45 |
| 850 General purpose fiscal assistance: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 2.10 | 2.10 | 2.10 |
| Outlays..... | 2.10 | 2.10 | 2.10 |
| 900 Net interest: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | 153.85 | 153.90 | 155.00 |
| Outlays..... | 153.85 | 153.90 | 155.00 |
| 920 Allowances: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | -3.45 | -0.60 | -0.70 |
| Outlays..... | -3.15 | -0.50 | -0.50 |
| 950 Undistributed offsetting receipts: | | | |
| Budget authority..... | -39.75 | -41.10 | -40.90 |
| Outlays..... | -39.75 | -41.10 | -40.90 |

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

The conferees accepted the economic assumptions shown in the table below as the basis for the revenue, spending and credit estimates in the conference substitute. These economic assumptions are the same as those used by the President in his FY 1986 budget submission in February. Both the House- and Senate-passed budget resolutions were based on these economic assumptions.

[In billions of dollars]

| | Calendar years | | | |
|--|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 |
| Gross national product: | | | | |
| Current dollars..... | \$3,948.2 | \$4,284.8 | \$4,642.8 | \$5,016.8 |
| Percent change..... | 7.8 | 8.5 | 8.3 | 8.1 |
| Constant (1972) dollars..... | \$1,702.5 | \$1,770.6 | \$1,841.4 | \$1,915.1 |
| Percent change..... | 3.9 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| GNP deflator (percent change, year over year)..... | 3.8 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 3.9 |
| CPI-W (percent change, year over year)..... | 4.1 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 3.9 |
| Unemployment rate—Civilian (percent)..... | 7.1 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 6.4 |
| 3-month Treasury bill rate (percent)..... | 8.1 | 7.9 | 7.2 | 5.9 |
| Memo: GNP, current dollars, fiscal year..... | \$3,868.5 | \$4,198.5 | \$4,550.9 | \$4,921.7 |

REVENUES

The House resolution provided a revenue floor of \$736.05 billion in FY 1985, \$794.10 billion in FY 1986, \$866.00 billion in FY 1987, and \$955.60 billion in FY 1988. It provided that revenues be decreased by \$0.15 billion in FY 1985, and increased by \$1.45 billion in FY 1986, \$1.70 billion in FY 1987, and \$3.10 billion in FY 1988.

The Senate resolution set a revenue floor of \$736.20 billion in FY 1985, \$793.6 billion in FY 1986, \$866.30 billion in FY 1987, and \$955.90 billion in FY 1988. It provided that revenues be increased by \$0.9 billion in FY 1986, \$2.0 billion in FY 1987, and \$3.4 billion in FY 1988.

The conference substitute sets a revenue floor of \$736.5 billion in FY 1985, \$795.7 billion in FY 1986, \$869.4 billion in FY 1987, and \$960.1 billion in FY 1988. It provides that revenues should be increased by \$3.0 billion in FY 1986, \$5.1 billion in FY 1987, and \$7.6 billion in FY 1988.

FUNCTION 150: EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

It is the intention of the conferees that up to \$1.8 billion may be made available for the Export-Import Bank loan programs. The allocation made pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act to the Senate Committee on Appropriations contained in this Statement of the Managers assumes a funding level of \$1.2 billion for this program. In the event that the relevant appropriations measure provides a higher level of funding, an additional allocation equal to the amount in the measure, but in any event no higher than \$600 million in budget authority and \$50 million in outlays for fiscal year 1986 will be made to the Senate Committee on Appropriations at the time such measure is reported.

When an allocation is made to the House Committee on Appropriations pursuant to section 302, such allocation will be accorded identical treatment.

FUNCTION 300: SUPERFUND

The conference agreement assumes that the revenues associated with the reauthorization of the Superfund program will be sufficient to cover Superfund outlays. In developing the funding levels assumed for the Superfund program, the conferees do not intend to prejudice the final outcome of reauthorization legislation.

FUNCTION 400: TRANSPORTATION TRUST FUNDS

As in the past, the conferees have followed the general policy of assigning reconciliation instructions to authorizing committees of jurisdiction. No instructions have been given to the Appropriations Committees. However, the conferees recognize that in the instances of certain transportation trust funds, jurisdiction over spending decisions has historically been shared, and the imposition of obligation limitations has been a desirable budget control device, permitting all accounts to be considered in setting spending priorities within certain budget functions. In making reconciliation instructions, therefore, the conferees do not intend to alter existing jurisdictional relationships, and expect that such relationships will continue as in the past.

FUNCTION 400: PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

The Conferees assume that any undistributed discretionary program reductions in

Function 400: Transportation will not affect any treaty requirements related to the Panama Canal Commission.

FUNCTION 450: HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ACTION GRANTS

The conference agreement assumes continued funding for the Housing Development Actions Grants (HoDAG) program from funds allocated to the assisted housing program.

FUNCTION 550: HEALTH
MEDICAID REPORT LANGUAGE

The Conference agreement assumes \$450 million in medicaid savings over three years from enhanced State efforts to collect payments from third party insurers. It is the intention of the conferees that collection efforts not adversely affect beneficiaries or States which make a reasonable effort to obtain payments. The conferees believe that there are cost effective techniques available to States to meet this goal without resulting in a loss of Federal funding or disruption of the medicaid program. Furthermore, the conferees intend that there will be no loss to States of Federal medicaid funds if collection efforts do not result in initially projected savings.

It is also the intent of the conferees that legislation which requires States to collect payments would be sufficient to meet the reconciliation assumptions.

FUNCTION 600: SCORING OF DEBT FORGIVENESS FOR PUBLIC HOUSING

The Managers agree that scorekeeping for reconciliation savings from assumed debt forgiveness for public housing notes should not be done in such a way as to require program reductions in place of the intended financing changes.

FUNCTION 650: SOCIAL SECURITY

The conferees have assumed some savings for administrative support in the Social Security Administration. It is not intended that these savings should result in staff reductions, office closings or otherwise have an adverse impact upon services to social security beneficiaries.

RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

The Senate resolution contained instructions regarding increased spending directed to 13 Senate committees and 14 House committees. The House amendment contained instructions of this nature directed to 10 House committees. The conference substitute contains instructions directed to 11 Senate committees and 14 House committees.

The Senate resolution provided that instructed committees would respond by June 30, 1985. The House amendment provided that instructed committees would respond within 30 calendar days of final action on this budget resolution. The conference substitute provides that committees must respond by September 27, 1985.

Neither the Senate resolution nor the House amendment contained instructions to change revenues. The conference substitute contains instructions to the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee to increase revenues.

SUMMARY OF RECONCILIATION SAVINGS BY SENATE COMMITTEE

[In millions of dollars]

| Senate committee | Fiscal year 1986 | | Fiscal year 1987 | | Fiscal year 1988 | | Total fiscal years 1986-88 | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------|----------------------------|---------|
| | Budget authority | Outlay | Budget authority | Outlay | Budget authority | Outlay | Budget authority | Outlay |
| Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry | | -1,250 | | -2,050 | | -4,600 | | -7,900 |
| Armed Services | | -100 | | -200 | | -300 | | -600 |
| Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs | -2,374 | -2,814 | -2,828 | -3,685 | -2,998 | -3,821 | -8,200 | -10,320 |
| Commerce, Science, and Transportation | -328 | -310 | -133 | -119 | -135 | -130 | -596 | -559 |
| Energy and Natural Resources | -5,485 | -5,403 | 291 | 147 | -337 | -314 | -5,531 | -5,570 |
| Environment and Public Works | | -200 | | -850 | | -1,050 | | -2,100 |
| Finance | | -3,307 | | -7,951 | | -10,908 | | -22,166 |
| Governmental Affairs | | -3,219 | | -4,421 | | -4,986 | | -12,626 |
| Labor and Human Resources | -670 | -170 | -860 | -525 | -1,085 | -960 | -2,615 | -1,665 |
| Small Business | -448 | -509 | -564 | -972 | -1,060 | -998 | -2,072 | -2,479 |
| Veterans' Affairs | -300 | -300 | -400 | -400 | -450 | -450 | -1,150 | -1,150 |
| Total reconciliation (spending) | -9,605 | -17,582 | -4,494 | -21,036 | -6,065 | -28,517 | -20,164 | -67,135 |
| Total reconciliation (revenues) | | +1,800 | | +3,000 | | +3,600 | | +8,400 |

SUMMARY OF RECONCILIATION SAVINGS BY HOUSE COMMITTEE

[In millions of dollars]

| House committee | 1986 | | 1987 | | 1988 | |
|--|------------------|--------|------------------|--------|------------------|--------|
| | Budget authority | Outlay | Budget authority | Outlay | Budget authority | Outlay |
| Agriculture Committee | | -1,250 | | -2,050 | | -4,600 |
| Armed Services Committee | | -100 | | -200 | | -300 |
| Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee | -2,374 | -2,814 | -2,828 | -3,685 | -2,998 | -3,821 |
| Energy and Commerce Committee | -1,513 | -3,947 | -1,246 | -5,008 | -1,401 | -6,512 |
| Education and Labor Committee | -670 | -470 | -860 | -835 | -1,085 | -1,260 |
| Government Operations Committee | | | | -3,526 | | -4,956 |
| Interior and Insular Affairs Committee | -4,000 | -4,000 | 1,504 | 1,504 | 1,029 | 1,029 |
| Judiciary Committee | -570 | -70 | -610 | -285 | -635 | -510 |
| Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee | -300 | -300 | -100 | -100 | -100 | -100 |
| Post Office and Civil Service Committee | | -3,219 | | -4,421 | | -4,986 |
| Public Works and Transportation Committee | | -200 | | -850 | | -1,050 |
| Small Business Committee | -448 | -509 | -564 | -972 | -1,060 | -998 |
| Veterans' Affairs Committee | -300 | -300 | -400 | -400 | -450 | -450 |
| Ways and Means Committee: deficit reduction | | -5,027 | | -7,245 | | -9,362 |

FISCAL YEAR 1985—CREDIT BUDGET TARGETS

[In billions of dollars]

| | House passed | Senate passed | Conference agreement |
|--|--------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Total new direct loan obligations | 51.95 | 52.80 | 52.85 |
| Total new primary loan guarantee commitments | 68.80 | 69.40 | 69.35 |
| Total new secondary loan guarantee commitments | 68.25 | 68.20 | 68.20 |
| FUNCTION | | | |
| 150 International affairs: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 10.05 | 11.50 | 11.50 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | 10.30 | 10.30 | 10.30 |
| 270 Energy: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 2.65 | 2.10 | 2.10 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | .10 | .10 | 0.10 |
| 300 Natural resources and environment: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | .05 | .10 | 0.10 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | | | |
| 350 Agriculture: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 13.80 | 13.80 | 13.80 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | 5.70 | 5.70 | 5.70 |
| 370 Commerce and housing credit: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 6.55 | 6.50 | 6.50 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | 26.45 | 27.00 | 26.90 |
| New secondary loan guarantee commitments | 68.25 | 68.20 | 68.20 |
| 400 Transportation: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | .30 | .30 | .30 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | .30 | .30 | .30 |
| 450 Community and regional development: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 1.75 | 1.80 | 1.70 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | .15 | .20 | .20 |
| 500 Education, training, employment and social services: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 1.15 | 1.10 | 1.20 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | 8.75 | 8.80 | 8.80 |
| 550 Health: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | .05 | | .05 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | .25 | .20 | .25 |

FISCAL YEAR 1985—CREDIT BUDGET TARGETS—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

| | House passed | Senate passed | Conference agreement |
|--|--------------|---------------|----------------------|
| 600 Income security: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 14.30 | 14.30 | 14.30 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | | | |
| 700 Veterans benefits and services: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 1.30 | 1.30 | 1.30 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | 16.80 | 16.80 | 16.80 |
| 920 Allowances: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | | | |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | | | |
| FISCAL YEAR 1986—CREDIT BUDGET TARGETS | | | |
| [In billions of dollars] | | | |
| | House passed | Senate passed | Conference agreement |
| Total new direct loan obligations | 38.05 | 30.10 | 34.40 |
| Total new primary loan guarantee commitments | 74.60 | 80.60 | 80.15 |
| Total new secondary loan guarantee commitments | 68.25 | 68.20 | 68.20 |
| FUNCTION | | | |
| 150 International affairs: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 10.35 | 8.20 | 9.90 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | 10.30 | 12.30 | 12.30 |
| 270 Energy: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 2.10 | 2.10 | 2.10 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | 4.10 | 4.10 | 4.10 |

FISCAL YEAR 1986—CREDIT BUDGET TARGETS—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

| | House passed | Senate passed | Conference agreement |
|--|--------------|---------------|----------------------|
| 300 Natural resources and environment: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | .05 | .10 | .05 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | | | |
| 350 Agriculture: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 13.90 | 11.70 | 13.60 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | 5.70 | 9.00 | 6.40 |
| 370 Commerce and housing credit: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 5.90 | 4.20 | 5.00 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | 27.10 | 28.40 | 28.20 |
| New secondary loan guarantee commitments | 68.25 | 68.20 | 68.20 |
| 400 Transportation: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | .15 | .20 | .20 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | .30 | .30 | .30 |
| 450 Community and regional development: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 1.30 | 1.20 | 1.10 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | .15 | .20 | .20 |
| 500 Education, training, employment and social services: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.10 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | 9.05 | 9.00 | 9.00 |
| 550 Health: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | .05 | | .05 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | .25 | .20 | .25 |
| 600 Income security: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 1.85 | | |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | | 1.80 | 1.80 |
| 700 Veterans benefits and services: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | 1.30 | 1.30 | 1.30 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | 17.65 | 15.30 | 17.60 |
| 920 Allowances: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations | | | |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments | | | |

FISCAL YEAR 1987—CREDIT BUDGET TARGETS

(In billions of dollars)

| | House passed | Senate passed | Conference agreement |
|--|--------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Total new direct loan obligations..... | 37.00 | 27.90 | 32.15 |
| Total new primary loan guarantee commitments..... | 73.00 | 81.30 | 79.05 |
| Total new secondary loan guarantee commitments..... | 68.25 | 68.20 | 68.20 |
| FUNCTION | | | |
| 150 International affairs: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 10.75 | 7.80 | 9.60 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | 10.75 | 12.30 | 12.30 |
| 270 Energy: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 2.10 | 2.10 | 2.10 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | | | |
| 300 Natural resources and environment: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | .05 | .10 | .10 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | | | |
| 350 Agriculture: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 12.15 | 10.20 | 11.40 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | 5.75 | 9.00 | 5.60 |
| 370 Commerce and housing credit: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 6.15 | 4.20 | 5.30 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | 28.65 | 30.10 | 29.90 |
| New secondary loan guarantee commitments..... | 68.25 | 68.20 | 68.20 |
| 400 Transportation: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | .15 | .10 | .10 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | .30 | .30 | .30 |
| 450 Community and regional development: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 1.70 | 1.10 | 1.20 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | .20 | .20 | .20 |
| 500 Education, training, employment and social services: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.10 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | 9.35 | 9.40 | 9.40 |
| 550 Health: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | .05 | | .05 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | .25 | .30 | .25 |
| 600 Income security: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 2.30 | | |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | | 2.30 | 2.30 |
| 700 Veterans benefits and services: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | 18.75 | 17.40 | 18.80 |
| 920 Allowances: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | -.70 | | |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | -1.0 | | |

FISCAL YEAR 1988—CREDIT BUDGET TARGETS

(In billions of dollars)

| | House passed | Senate passed | Conference agreement |
|---|--------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Total new direct loan obligations..... | 36.45 | 27.30 | 31.40 |
| Total new primary loan guarantee commitments..... | 76.90 | 85.50 | 84.00 |
| Total new secondary loan guarantee commitments..... | 68.25 | 68.20 | 68.20 |
| FUNCTION | | | |
| 150 International affairs: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 11.00 | 7.90 | 9.70 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | 11.20 | 12.30 | 12.30 |
| 270 Energy: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 2.15 | 2.10 | 2.10 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | | | |
| 300 Natural resources and environment: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | .05 | | .05 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | | | |
| 350 Agriculture: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 11.80 | 9.10 | 10.50 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | 5.75 | 9.00 | 6.90 |
| 370 Commerce and housing credit: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 6.65 | 4.50 | 5.40 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | 30.45 | 31.90 | 31.70 |
| New secondary loan guarantee commitments..... | 68.25 | 68.20 | 68.20 |
| 400 Transportation: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | .10 | .10 | .10 |

FISCAL YEAR 1988—CREDIT BUDGET TARGETS—Continued

(In billions of dollars)

| | House passed | Senate passed | Conference agreement |
|--|--------------|---------------|----------------------|
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | .30 | .30 | .30 |
| 450 Community and regional development: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 1.95 | 1.30 | 1.30 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | .20 | .20 | .20 |
| 500 Education, training, employment and social services: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 1.15 | 1.10 | 1.10 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | 9.60 | 9.60 | 9.60 |
| 550 Health: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | .05 | | .05 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | .30 | .30 | .30 |
| 600 Income security: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 1.75 | | |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | | 1.80 | 1.80 |
| 700 Veterans benefits and services: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | 1.10 | 1.20 | 1.10 |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | 20.90 | 20.10 | 20.90 |
| 920 Allowances: | | | |
| New direct loan obligations..... | -1.30 | | |
| New primary loan guarantee commitments..... | -1.80 | | |

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

APPROPRIATIONS CAPS

The Senate resolution provided a point of order against the consideration of an appropriations bill in the House or Senate if the enactment of that bill would cause total aggregate budget authority to exceed the amounts stated for function 050, National Defense, or the amounts stated for nondefense discretionary activities.

The House amendment contained no such provision.

The Senate receded to the House.

AUTOMATIC SECOND BUDGET RESOLUTION

The Senate resolution provide that this resolution shall be deemed to be the second concurrent resolution on the budget for FY 1986 for the purposes of section 311 of the Budget Act if Congress has not completed action on a second resolution by October 1, 1985.

The House amendment provided language virtually identical to that of the Senate resolution which achieved the same result. The House amendment further provided that committees would be held harmless against a point of order under section 311 of the Budget Act for violation of spending ceilings if those committees remain within their section 302(a) allocation for FY 1986. In addition, the House amendment provided that if any off-budget programs contained in a list in the House report are brought into the unified budget, the budget authority and outlays for those programs shall not be included in determining violations of section 311 of the Budget Act. The House amendment also provided that if Congress subsequently adopts a second budget resolution for FY 1986, all of the provisions of this section will cease to apply.

The House conferees receded to the Senate with an amendment making the provision holding committees harmless applicable only to the House.

TAX REFORM

The Senate resolution contained language regarding the need for tax reform. The provision presented certain findings of the Senate regarding the inequities and disadvantages of the current tax structure. It also expressed the sense of the Senate that tax reform legislation should be adopted as

soon as possible, incorporating specified objectives and principals.

The House amendment contained language identical to the Senate provision, except that it expressed the findings and sense of the House.

The Senate conferees receded to the House with an amendment to express the sense of the Congress.

CBO SCOREKEEPING REQUIREMENTS

The Senate resolution contained a provision expressing the sense of the Senate that CBO should make weekly reports when the Senate is in session regarding the current status of congressional action with respect to the limitations on spending, revenues and the public debt established by the most recent budget resolution.

The House amendment contained no such provision.

The House conferees receded to the Senate.

FARM LOSS DEDUCTIONS

The Senate resolution contained a provision expressing the sense of the Senate that legislation should be enacted to limit to the national median family income the amount of farm-related losses which can be deducted against nonfarm income, and that the resulting additional revenues should be used to reduce individual income tax rates, and to assure that family-operated farms do not suffer a disadvantaged as against farm operations with substantial nonfarm income.

The House amendment contained no such provision.

The House conferees receded to the Senate.

ENHANCED TAX LAW ENFORCEMENT

The Senate resolution contained a provision expressing the sense of the Congress that legislation should be reported by the Senate Finance Committee and enacted to increase compliance with the tax code. Such legislation should concern improved enforcement and collection, increased staff, and efforts to improve taxpayer assistance. The resulting increased revenue could be used to reduce income tax rates, reduce the deficit, or other unspecified purposes.

The House amendment contained no such provision.

The House conferees receded to the Senate with an amendment referencing the House Ways and Means Committee and deleting the language regarding use of the increased revenue.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY CONFERENCE

The House amendment contained a provision expressing the sense of the Congress that the Administration should call for the convening of an international conference to discuss the stabilization of currency exchange rates, the reduction of interest rates, the promotion of maximum economic growth, and the assurance of domestic stability.

The Senate resolution contained no such provision.

The Senate receded to the House with an amendment.

GRACE COMMISSION REVIEW

The House amendment contained a provision expressing the sense of the House that all House committees should review the findings of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control relating to programs within their jurisdiction and consider those findings during their review of legislation. Each report accompanying legislation should identify those recommendations im-

plemented in that legislation, their budgetary impact, and an explanation of every recommendation which relates to the legislation and a discussion of its disposition.

The Senate resolution contained no such provision.

The Senate conferees receded to the House.

LIMITATION ON BENEFITS TO ALIENS

The Senate resolution contained a provision expressing the sense of the Congress that social security benefits paid to illegal and nonresident aliens should be limited to the amount of the wage-earner's contribution plus interest and states the assumption that the Senate Finance Committee will report legislation to accomplish this. This limitation would apply to individuals becoming eligible after January 1, 1986.

The House amendment contained a provision identical to the Senate provision except that it referenced the House Ways and Means Committee instead of the Senate Finance Committee.

The House conferees receded to the Senate with an amendment referencing the House Committee on Ways and Means.

ANNUAL DETERMINATION OF CREDIT ACTIVITY THROUGH THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

The Senate resolution provided that it shall not be in order to consider legislation authorizing new direct loan obligations of loan guarantee commitments which does not limit such activity to amounts appropriated in advance. Legislation reported in response to the reconciliation instructions contained in this resolution is exempted. Legislation regarding Commodity Credit

Corporation price support and related programs in operation on January 1, 1985 is also exempted.

The House amendment contained no such provision.

The Senate conferees receded to the House.

ELIMINATION OF DISTINCTION BETWEEN "UNIFIED BUDGET" AND "OFF-BUDGET" SPENDING

The Senate resolution contained a provision expressing the sense of Congress that the distinction between "unified budget" and "off-budget" spending should be terminated, and that the budget authority and outlays for so-called "off-budget" agencies should be included in the budget totals.

The House amendment contained no such provision.

The Senate conferees receded to the House.

The conferees intend that the functional and aggregate totals included in this resolution, reflecting both "on-budget" and "off-budget" spending, will govern for the purposes of the congressional budget process, scorekeeping, and enforcement. It is not the intent of the conferees to prejudice the action of committees of jurisdiction in their legislative oversight of program not presently included in the unified budget of the federal government.

WIC FUNDING

The Senate resolution contained language expressing the sense of the Senate that the full amount of appropriations for FY 1985, currently being withheld from obligations by OMB, should be apportioned among the states, pursuant to public law.

The House amendment contained language identical to the Senate provision, except that it expresses the sense of the Congress.

The conference substitute does not contain this language.

CONFORMING OVERTIME REQUIREMENTS

The Senate resolution contained language expressing the sense of the Congress that the overtime requirements contained in the Walsh-Healey Act and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act should be conformed to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The House amendment contained no such provision.

The Senate conferees receded to the House.

MINIMUM TAX

The Senate resolution contained a provision expressing the sense of Congress that a minimum tax should be enacted so that all corporations and individuals with economic income will pay tax, and that the resulting revenue should be used to reduce individual income tax rates and to increase threshold amounts for tax payments by individuals when tax reform legislation is considered.

The House amendment contained no such provision.

The Senate conferees receded to the House.

ALLOCATION OF BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS TO SENATE COMMITTEES

Pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act, the conference substitute makes the following allocation of budget authority and outlays among the committees of the Senate.

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SEC. 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1985

[In millions of dollars]

| Committees | Direct spending jurisdiction | | Entitlements funded in annual appropriation acts | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------|--|--------|
| | Budget authority | Outlay | Budget authority | Outlay |
| Appropriations | 576,084 | 531,709 | | |
| Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry | 15,528 | 24,086 | 12,420 | 132 |
| Armed Services | 38,499 | 26,620 | 147 | 208 |
| Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs | 20,649 | 14,960 | | |
| Commerce, Science, and Transportation | 1,719 | 267 | 346 | 356 |
| Energy and Natural Resources | 1,024 | 373 | 54 | 56 |
| Environment and Public Works | 15,571 | 933 | 6 | 6 |
| Finance | 504,055 | 477,641 | 43,639 | 46,229 |
| Foreign Relations | 15,466 | 13,375 | | |
| Governmental Affairs | 51,890 | 33,345 | (1) | (1) |
| Judiciary | 570 | 477 | 78 | 76 |
| Labor and Human Resources | 4,071 | 2,657 | 6,083 | 5,952 |
| Rules and Administration | 45 | 9 | | |
| Small Business | 485 | 378 | | |
| Veterans' Affairs | 1,502 | 1,141 | 15,317 | 15,416 |
| Select Indian Affairs | 445 | 443 | | |
| Not allocated to committees | -185,503 | -183,113 | | |
| Total, budget | 1,062,100 | 946,300 | 78,088 | 68,432 |

¹ Less than \$500,000.

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SEC. 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1986

[In millions of dollars]

| Committees | Direct spending jurisdiction | | Entitlements funded in annual appropriation acts | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--|--------|
| | Budget authority | Outlay | Budget authority | Outlay |
| Appropriations | 565,410 | 552,084 | | |
| Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry | 18,198 | 17,275 | 213 | 218 |
| Armed Services | 40,622 | 28,068 | 165 | 165 |
| Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs | 6,710 | 3,215 | | |
| Commerce, Science, and Transportation | 1,651 | 151 | 352 | 358 |
| Energy and Natural Resources | -2,468 | -2,839 | | |
| Environment and Public Works | 16,266 | 573 | 6 | 6 |
| Finance | 540,805 | 510,642 | 46,622 | 46,723 |
| Foreign Relations | 15,208 | 13,000 | | |
| Governmental Affairs | 54,043 | 34,687 | | |
| Judiciary | 512 | 439 | 82 | 82 |
| Labor and Human Resources | 4,273 | 2,608 | 5,568 | 5,572 |

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SEC. 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1986—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

| Committees | Direct spending jurisdiction | | Entitlements funded in annual appropriation acts | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|----------|--|--------|
| | Budget authority | Outlay | Budget authority | Outlay |
| Rules and Administration | 45 | 8 | | |
| Small Business | 309 | 153 | | |
| Veterans' Affairs | 1,502 | 1,316 | 15,557 | 14,525 |
| Select Indian Affairs | 458 | 457 | | |
| Not allocated to committees | -193,756 | -193,935 | | |
| Total, budget | 1,069,700 | 967,600 | 68,564 | 68,647 |

¹ Less than \$500,000.

WILLIAM H. GRAY III,
JIM WRIGHT,
THOMAS J. DOWNEY,
MIKE LOWRY,
BUTLER DERRICK,
VIC FAZIO,
GEO. MILLER,
MARTIN FROST,
DELBERT LATTA,
JACK KEMP,
LYNN MARTIN,
BOBBI FIEDLER,
BEAU BOULTER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE V. DOMENICI,
WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG,
NANCY LANDON
KASSEBAUM,
RUDY BOSCHWITZ,
SLADE GORTON,
LAWTON CHILES,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
JIM SASSER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32), setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988, and revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1985.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read the report.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report be considered as read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GRAY OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania moves, pursuant to House Resolution 253, that the House recede from its amendment to Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 and concur with an amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause of S. Con. Res. 32 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Congress hereby determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 is hereby revised and replaced, the first concurrent res-

olution on the budget for fiscal year 1986 is hereby established, and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1987 and 1988 are hereby set forth.

(a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, October 1, 1986, and October 1, 1987:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$736,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: \$795,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$869,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$960,100,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$0.
Fiscal year 1986: \$3,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$5,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$7,600,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$44,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: \$50,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$56,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$61,200,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$186,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: \$200,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$216,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$248,000,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$1,062,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: \$1,069,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$1,137,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$1,216,450,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$946,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: \$967,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$1,024,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$1,073,000,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits in the budget which are appropriate in the light of economic conditions and all other relevant factors are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$209,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: \$171,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$154,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$112,900,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$1,847,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: \$2,078,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: \$2,301,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: \$2,507,000,000,000.

and the amounts by which the statutory limits on such debt should be accordingly increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: \$24,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1986: \$230,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1987: \$223,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1988: \$205,100,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, October 1, 1986, and October 1, 1987, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$52,850,000

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$69,350,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$34,400,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$80,150,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$32,150,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$79,050,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$31,400,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$84,000,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments, for fiscal years 1985 through 1988 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, \$292,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$249,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, \$302,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$267,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, \$323,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$85,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$346,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$303,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (2) International Affairs (150):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,500,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$10,300,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,850,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,900,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$12,300,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,600,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$12,300,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,450,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,700,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$12,300,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,050,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,550,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$4,100,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,850,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,150,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,950,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,450,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,750,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,150,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,950,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$13,800,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$5,700,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,550,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$13,600,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,250,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,400,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$5,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,750,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,500,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,900,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$6,500,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$26,900,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$5,000,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$28,200,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,450,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$5,300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$29,900,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,850,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$5,400,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$31,700,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$68,200,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,850,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,750,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,700,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,950,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,050,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,850,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$8,800,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,550,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,850,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$9,000,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,350,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,350,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$9,400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,950,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$9,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$250,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$250,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$250,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (12) Medical Insurance (570):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$81,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$94,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$84,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$164,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$128,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$14,300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$155,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$119,050,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$1,800,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$163,750,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$124,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,300,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$172,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$130,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$1,800,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$198,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$189,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$207,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$200,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$224,750,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$214,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$264,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$228,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$16,800,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,450,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$17,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,550,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,250,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,800,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,650,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$20,900,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,050,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,150,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,450,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,450,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (18) General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (850):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (19) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$129,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$129,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$142,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$142,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$152,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$152,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$155,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$155,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (20) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,650,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 1985:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1986:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1987:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1988:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

RECONCILIATION.

SEC. 2. (a) Not later than September 27, 1985, the committees named in subsections (b) through (z) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committees on the Budget of their respective Houses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committees on the budget shall report to the House and Senate a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SENATE COMMITTEES

(b) The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in

laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$0 in budget authority and \$1,250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$0 in budget authority and \$2,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$0 in budget authority and \$4,600,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(c) The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to achieve savings of \$0 in budget authority and \$100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$0 in budget authority and \$200,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$0 in budget authority and \$300,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(d) The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) change in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$2,374,000,000 in budget authority and \$2,814,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$2,828,000,000 in budget authority and \$3,685,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$2,998,000,000 in budget authority and \$3,821,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(e) The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$328,000,000 in budget authority and \$310,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$133,000,000 in budget authority and \$119,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$135,000,000 in budget authority and \$130,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(f) The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, or (3) any combination thereof, sufficient to achieve the following: savings of \$5,485,000,000 in budget authority and \$5,403,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, increases of \$291,000,000 in budget authority and \$147,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and savings of \$337,000,000 in budget authority and \$314,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(g) The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in

laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) by combination thereof, as follows: \$0 in budget authority and \$200,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$0 in budget authority and \$850,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$0 in budget authority and \$1,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(h)(1) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$0 in budget authority and \$3,307,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$0 in budget authority and \$7,951,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$0 in budget authority and \$10,908,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(2) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of the committee sufficient to increase revenues as follows: \$1,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; \$3,000,000,000, in fiscal year 1987; and \$3,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(i) The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$0 in budget authority and \$3,219,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$0 in budget authority and \$4,421,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$0 in budget authority and \$4,986,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(j) The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$670,000,000 in budget authority and \$170,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$860,000,000 in budget authority and \$535,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$1,085,000,000 in budget authority and \$960,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(k) The Senate Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$448,000,000 in budget authority and \$509,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986,

\$564,000,000 in budget authority and \$972,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$1,060,000,000 in budget authority and \$998,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(l) The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$300,000,000 in budget authority and \$300,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$400,000,000 in budget authority and \$400,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$450,000,000 in budget authority and \$450,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(m) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce outlays by \$1,250,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce outlays by \$2,050,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce outlays by \$4,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(n) The House Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays by \$100,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce outlays by \$200,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce outlays by \$300,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(o) The House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$2,374,000,000 in budget authority and \$2,814,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986; \$2,828,000,000 in budget authority and \$3,685,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$2,998,000,000 in budget authority and \$3,821,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(p) The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$670,000,000 and outlays by \$470,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce budget authority by \$860,000,000 and outlays by \$835,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce budget authority by \$1,085,000,000 and outlays by \$1,260,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(q) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$1,513,000,000 in budget authority and \$3,947,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$1,246,000,000 in budget authority and \$5,008,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987,

and \$1,401,000,000 in budget authority and \$6,512,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(r) The House Committee on Government Operations shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays by \$0 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce outlays by \$3,526,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce outlays by \$4,956,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(s) The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$4,000,000,000 and outlays by \$4,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to increase budget authority by \$1,504,000,000 and outlays by \$1,504,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to increase budget authority by \$1,029,000,000 and outlays by \$1,029,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(t) The House Committee on Judiciary shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$570,000,000 and outlays by \$70,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce budget authority by \$610,000,000 and outlays by \$285,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce budget authority by \$635,000,000 and outlays by \$510,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(u) The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$300,000,000 and outlays by \$300,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce budget authority by \$100,000,000 and outlays by \$100,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce budget authority by \$100,000,000 and outlays by \$100,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(v) The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$3,219,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$4,421,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$4,986,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(w) The House Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce outlays by \$200,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, to reduce outlays by \$850,000,000 in fiscal year 1987, and to reduce outlays by \$1,050,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(x) The House Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in Section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$448,000,000 in budget authority and \$509,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, \$564,000,000 in budget authority and \$972,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and \$1,060,000,000 in budget authority and \$998,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(y) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce budget authority by \$300,000,000 and outlays by \$300,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce budget authority by \$400,000,000 and outlays by \$400,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce budget authority by \$450,000,000 and outlays by \$450,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(z) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce the budget deficit by \$5,027,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; to reduce the budget deficit by \$7,245,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and to reduce the budget deficit by \$9,362,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS AUTOMATIC SECOND BUDGET RESOLUTION

SEC. 3. (a) If the Congress has not completed action by October 1, 1985, on the concurrent resolution on the budget required to be reported under section 310(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for fiscal year 1986, then, for purposes of section 311 of such Act, this concurrent resolution shall be deemed to be the concurrent resolution required to be reported under section 310 of such Act.

(b) In the House of Representatives, section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as made applicable by subsection (a) of this section, shall not apply to bills, resolutions, or amendments within the jurisdiction of a committee, or any conference report on any such bill or resolution, if—

(1) the enactment of such bill or resolution as reported

(2) the adoption and enactment of such amendment; or

(3) the enactment of such bill or resolution in the form recommended in such conference report;

would not cause the appropriate allocation for such committee of new discretionary budget authority or new spending authority as described in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 made pursuant to section 302(a) of such Act for fiscal year 1986 to be exceeded.

TAX REFORM

SEC. 4. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the existing tax structure of the United States distorts economic activity, leading to an inefficient use of national resources and a weakening of our domestic economic vitality and competitive posture in international markets.

(2) the relating tax burdens among various taxpayer categories are manifestly unfair insofar as they arise from differences in the capabilities of taxpayers to take advantage of complicated tax laws.

(3) the ability of the Federal Government to plan and conduct rational fiscal policy is frustrated by elaborate schemes to avoid taxation and the unintended effects of tax incentives and penalties;

(4) progressive erosion of voluntary compliance threatens the fiscal integrity of our public finances and the confidence of our citizens in the Federal Government's capacity to govern; and

(5) a number of plans, each designed to simplify and reform the Tax Code, have been before the Congress for a time sufficient to allow for extensive analysis and evaluation.

(b) It is therefore the sense of the Congress that tax reform should be adopted as soon as possible, and that it should incorporate the following principles and objectives:

(1) efficiency and responsiveness to market conditions in the economic activities of American businesses and consumers;

(2) simplicity of structure and lower marginal tax rates;

(3) a fair and equitable distribution of the tax burden among all taxpayers, with relief for those below the poverty level, and incentives to bring them into the work force;

(4) a broader tax base, with deductions essential to avoid genuine hardship or to protect the economic security of the American people; and

(5) increased incentives for work, saving, and investment.

CBO SCOREKEEPING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 5. It is the sense of the Senate that because the Senate requires timely reporting of legislative action on spending bills, and because the Senate requires continual control over the budget, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall issue a weekly report during periods when the Senate is in session detailing and tabulating the progress of congressional action on bills and resolutions providing new budget authority and changing revenues and the public debt for a fiscal year, including, but not limited to the requirements set forth in Public Law 93-344, section 308(b).

FARM LOSS DEDUCTION

SEC. 6. It is the sense of the Senate that revenues should be increased and it is assumed that tax legislation will be enacted to limit to the national median family income the amount of farm loss which may be deducted against nonfarm income, and it is further assumed that revenues derived from enactment of such legislation be used to reduce individual income tax rates and to assure that full-time, family-size farm operators will not be disadvantaged by unfair competition from high-income taxpayers with substantial nonfarm income.

ENHANCED TAX LAW ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 7. It is the sense of the Congress that revenues should be increased and it is assumed that the Committees on Finance and Ways and Means will develop legislation to reduce the tax enforcement gap, estimated by the Internal Revenue Service at \$92,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1986. It is further assumed that such legislation should provide for increased and improved enforcement and collection, through audits, examinations, and other steps designed to identify and eliminate tax cheating and increase revenue collections from individuals and corporations currently evading Federal taxes, and that the legislation should include steps designed to increase voluntary compliance with tax laws and that such steps may include increased staff for taxpayer assistance, speedier processing of returns and provision of public information designed to build public trust and understanding of Internal Revenue Service enforcement efforts and that such legislation should also provide that the resources of the Internal Revenue Service shall be increased to accomplish full enforcement of United States tax laws, increasing voluntary compliance.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY CONFERENCE

SEC. 8. It is the sense of the Congress that the Administration should consider convening a high level meeting of the major industrial countries for the express purpose of exploring options to improve the functioning of the international monetary system, including measures to stabilize currency exchange rates, reduce interest rates, promote maximum domestic and world economic

growth, and help assure domestic price stability.

COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT'S PRIVATE SECTOR SURVEY ON COST CONTROL

SEC. 9. It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) each of its standing committees should review and study, on a continuing basis, those portions of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control affecting subjects within its jurisdiction;

(2) each of its standing committees should, in its consideration of any bill or joint resolution of a public character within its jurisdiction, review those portions of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control pertaining to such bill or resolution; and

(3) each report of any such committee on a bill or joint resolution of a public character should contain—

(A) an identification of each recommendation of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control implemented in such bill or resolution and the estimated dollar amount of program cost savings or revenue enhancement as a result of the implementation of each such recommendation; and

(B) a statement setting forth each recommendation of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control pertaining to such bill or resolution, the disposition of each such recommendation, and the reasons for such disposition.

LIMITATION ON BENEFITS TO ALIENS

SEC. 10. It is the sense of the Congress that functional totals should be reduced to reflect a limitation on the amount of social security benefits paid to illegal and nonresident aliens. It is assumed that the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee will report legislation to accomplish the required changes in law. Such legislation may limit benefits to the amount of wage-earner's contribution plus interest, unless the wage-earner is a citizen of a country with which the United States has a treaty or totalization agreement and that this provision would apply to individuals becoming eligible on or after January 1, 1986.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] opposed to the bill?

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the bill.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I believe then that under rule XXVIII, a Member in opposition to the bill is entitled to 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. Under the rule, the gentleman is entitled to one-third of the time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us the budget for 1986. What you will find, if you look at this document, is that we left the House with a budget resolution that reduced spending by \$56.2 billion in 1986, and a total deficit reduction in fiscal years 1986 to 1988 of \$259.1 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform my colleagues that after a very lengthy and a very long conference, we have come forward with a conference agreement that has a deficit reduction in fiscal year 1986 of \$57.45 billion, a total reduction of the deficit in fiscal years 1986 to 1988 of \$279.56 billion, and a remaining deficit in fiscal year 1988 of \$112.9 billion.

Let me stress to the Members of this body the components of the conference agreement.

First of all, I would like to point out that this conference agreement maintains the bipartisan approach of the House on the COLA units. Social Security and other retirement programs have been fully funded, as was the case in most of the major proposals before the House.

Second, I would also point out to my colleagues that the low-income and high-priority programs that we had in the House-passed budget resolution were maintained. This includes full inflation adjustments for these low-income programs, and increases above inflation for selected health programs, accommodating House committee action on nutrition programs.

With regard to reductions in the domestic section, the conference agreement includes \$22 billion in domestic program reduction beyond those assumed in the House-passed resolution. However, the House was able to resist efforts by the other body to terminate many programs, including UDAG, CDBG, EDA, Tennessee Valley Authority, and Appalachian Regional Commission. Important programs such as assisted housing, rural housing, and Superfund are funded near levels assumed in the House resolution or House appropriation bills.

All veteran programs are funded at the House-passed levels in 1986.

In the area of Medicare and Medicaid, the savings of \$11 billion in Medicare and \$450 million in Medicaid are assumed over 3 years. This represents

a slight increase above the House position. In Medicare, it represents an increase of about \$1.2 billion, and in Medicaid, it assumes a reduction of \$450 million with regard to the third-party reimbursements, which will not be scored against Federal contribution to States or to the States themselves, thus preserving the intention of the House to provide full inflation for this low-income health program.

The conference agreement includes language stating that it is the intention of the conference that the collection efforts not adversely affect any of the beneficiaries or States which make a reasonable effort to make reductions.

Let me also add that the distinguished Ways and Means Committee chairman and his members have been given responsibilities which they have historically met with regard to revenues, and there is not in this budget a proposal with regard to inclusion of State employees.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by pointing out that we had a long and difficult conference. However, given the political reality with regard to the administration's position on revenues, given the reality of the House's bipartisan position with regard to the COLA unit, I believe, Mr. Speaker, when we look at this reality, that we have come forth with a deficit reduction package, and a budget that moves us in the right direction with strong deficit reduction over 3 years of \$279.56 billion, and at the same time we have returned with a greater deficit reduction in fiscal year 1986 than when we left the House.

Let me also point out in the area of function 050, military spending, what we have done is in that area we have adopted the same position of the House/Senate conferees of \$302 billion in budget authority, and the outlays for 1986 as well as any outyears, or the outlay interpretations of the House of Representatives.

Let me just say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this document, like all budget documents that reflect a process is not a perfect one. I am sure that Members will find fault with one area or another, things that they would have liked to have seen done differently.

However, I believe when we look at the whole, when we look at the entire document and understand that it represents ceilings, it represents ceilings which allow our appropriations and authorizations committees to work under, I believe that this body will agree with this chairman and the House conferees that this is a good budget, considering those realities.

I would urge my colleagues to adopt it with an "aye" vote.

□ 1910

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that as has been indicated here before, when you vote "yes" on this resolution, you are voting that you prefer this resolution to the one the House overwhelmingly adopted 2 weeks ago.

This resolution becomes a substitute for the budget resolution we passed just 2 weeks ago, which confirmed that we would use the House budget resolution passed earlier in the year.

Now what does adopting a new resolution mean? It means that we are already, after 2 weeks, abandoning the principle of freeze. The Committee on Appropriations was told to proceed with the idea that we are going to freeze all these budgets this year, and to adopt budgets that, under these various functions, would be at freeze level or below.

Eight appropriations bills have been acted upon in the House so far. They are a total of \$8 billion below the 1985 appropriations level.

This resolution in one fell swoop adds \$10 billion, that is \$10,000 million to function 050, more than the amount that has been cut out in these eight appropriation bills and it reverses the instructions we were given 2 weeks ago.

Now how can you expect the Appropriations Committee in these bills to stand by the idea of the freeze if the House now abandons the freeze in this bill? That would give us new instructions. "Forget about the freeze." That is the way it will be interpreted.

Now, do not kid yourselves, we are going to have a continuing resolution. There are only about 20 days left in this Congress before the new fiscal year. We are going to be over there October 1st working on a continuing resolution and at that time, you will have a limit on the amount of budget authority within which to work. An additional \$10 billion will have been absorbed in this resolution; it instructs us that \$302 billion is the goal instead of the \$292 billion for function 050, the military. That means that there will be a bigger squeeze than ever on other functions.

How are they going to make that up? Look at what you are voting for here if you vote "yes."

One way they do in this resolution is to reconcile part of that by taking \$2.454 billion out of Medicare. That is this year. Next year \$3.452 billion and the year after that \$4.949 billion.

On the other hand, defense will go from \$292 billion in 1985 to \$302 billion in 1986 to \$323 billion in 1987 to \$346 billion in 1988.

That is \$54 billion by 1988. That is the goal that you are setting when you say "yes" to this resolution. On the other hand the agriculture function is cut 40 percent in that period.

Each Member has a right to believe that that is the way we ought to proceed with this budget, but anyone who is serious about cutting budgets, should know there is no way that you can vote "yes" for this as a preference over the budget we adopted 2 weeks ago and say that you are voting for freezes across the board in this fiscal year.

The past 3 weeks, we have had about 25 votes on the floor to cut a few thousand dollars out of a number of programs. Some Members who voted for all of those will now vote for this resolution and they will say then "I voted 25 times to cut the budget," but this one time will more than offset all that they did if they voted for all of those cuts.

We are just putting a squeeze on the wrong people, it is the wrong message to send; an "aye" vote for this resolution tonight is a vote to abandon the freeze, the freeze principle that we have had so far this Congress. It is a vote for reconciliation to take more out of Medicare, to take more out of SBA, take more out of programs that the President wanted to cut far below freeze level.

I urge you to vote "no" on the resolution.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my good friend from Iowa who was just in the well that he has been in a lot of conferences and in every conference there is give and take. No one, no one ever expects to come back from conference, certainly on a bill of this magnitude, with the same exact bill that went over there. There is another body that we have to be concerned with. If the gentleman had sat in on some of the conferences that we had and had seen the difficult time that we had getting the figures that he wanted, and we know that he is interested in more than just one function of this budget, I do not think he would be down there protesting quite as loudly as he is now.

Also let me point out that we came to the outlay figure, that low outlay figure on 050 that was passed by the House. Do not overlook that fact.

Let me say when we came down to that figure, we gave a lot. We also have to think about the appropriations process.

You know, the gentleman serves on the Committee on Appropriations. We merely set the parameters. The Committee on Appropriations is going to say how much money we are going to vote for 050 or any other function. So let us not make a mountain out of a molehill.

I think this conference committee under the able leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] has done an admirable job, an admirable job. Let us not tear him and his work down.

I said early on I am going to support this because we got \$55 billion in savings. We have taken out that contracting in or contracting out, whatever you want to call it. We have come up with some savings to reduce the debt.

You can vote against those savings if you like and go home and try to answer to the people that you represent, who have been clamoring for lower interest rates in this country. Listening to Mr. Volcker, he says "Give me \$50 billion in reductions and it will bring interest rates down."

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] represents a very good agricultural area. Who is hurting from high interest rates any more than the farmer? He can answer that. We want to bring those interest rates down so we are going to put the ball in Mr. Volcker's court when we pass this piece of legislation and say "Bring the interest rates down."

For those people who are interested in bringing the interest rates down, to vote and go back home and say "I voted to bring interest rates down by voting a \$55 billion savings in expenditures," I do not know whether you could put that line across. They will not follow that in Ohio. They might follow it in Iowa, but not in Ohio.

Let me say further that we have done something in this budget that is extremely important, especially to the Members on our side. One of the reasons I am supporting this conference report is that we put teeth, teeth into this conference report. We have increased those reconciliation numbers to \$68 billion. We have come up from 37, as this resolution passed the House. We are doing something about reducing expenditures.

Let me say further that everybody watches what the National Federation of Independent Businesses think about legislation, as to how it affects their businesses across this country.

I have in my hand a letter dated today from that association, commending the conference committee report on its piece of work and saying "Once again, FIB commends you for your reference and are pleased to support the conference report as a key small business vote."

That is dated today, August 1, 1985.

The business people of this Nation know what they want and they know that tonight they want an affirmative vote from this House in support of this conference report.

Oh, I could get up here and start to pick it apart. I could get up here and go down the line on those things that happened in the conference committee

that I did not support. I could have said to BILL GRAY, "I am not going to support the conference report if you don't give me this, that, or the other thing."

I realize that we have a conference report, over \$900 billion. To pick it apart by some little function, even though we are talking about \$10 billion out of almost a \$1 trillion budget, we have got to consider the ramifications of what you are attempting to do.

So let us not torpedo a \$55 billion savings in 1 year, \$277 billion in savings over 3 years to bring that whopping deficit down by saying "I did not get exactly as I wanted. So I am going to vote against it."

That will not sell in Ohio, I do not think it will sell in America.

□ 1920

We ought to support this conference report, and the work of BILL GRAY and his committee.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK].

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, we have a budget resolution before us tonight, a resolution that many of us thought would not be here just 3 or 4 days ago, a resolution that the American people want, need, and deserve.

It is like everything else that happens in this House, in this town. It is not an absolute; it is a compromise. There is a lot in there I do not like, and I am sure that applies to everyone here.

The fact of the matter is, it gives some order to our fiscal spending, and we should pass it tonight. Now, there are those who suggest that because we have the \$302 billion Pentagon budget authority that they are not going to support it.

Well, our Speaker told us this morning that he was going to request of the Rules Committee that the Rules Committee give a rule on the DOD authorization bill, that would allow the House to exercise its will; 302 versus 292.

I am going to vote for the 292, then, but I am going to also vote for this budget resolution because the country needs it, and do not forget, we need it for our credibility when we go back home.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this resolution but it is important to understand that this resolution increases military carryover \$10 billion more than we agreed to a few weeks ago.

I said earlier that I was chairman of the committee that set up and promot-

ed the Budget Committee. I served on it the first time. Why? 42 percent of our spending was avoiding annual review through our committee.

We agreed to the House passed budget resolution, we do not need the Senate to agree. We just need to make them follow our budget, which we passed a few weeks ago.

Our committee has reduced spending in appropriation bills about \$9 billion.

So I just want to say I am going to vote for this resolution. So I am going to vote for it, but I hope you will help me hold the House budget.

I hope our Appropriations Committee can hold the line as we are doing, and I hope we have the help of our friends on the Budget Committee.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. FIEDLER].

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to simply make a couple of comments about the process that it took to bring us to this point, and I would like to offer my personal commendations to the chairman, Chairman GRAY, and to our ranking member, DEL LATTA, and to PETE DOMENICI, who did such an outstanding job of sticking with it.

I have served on conference committees ever since I came to the conference, I have never been involved in a more difficult conference. There were tremendous political issues which had to be resolved on both sides; both the House and the Senate as well as on both sides of the aisle in each respective body, and the stick-to-itiveness that was shown on the part of our leadership is something that each and every Member of this House ought to applaud.

Because very frankly, had they not stuck to their effort, we would not have a budget before us today, and it did take a good deal of compromise and conciliation on everyone's part.

I do not think that there is a Member on the floor that believes that this is the best of all possible worlds when it comes to a budget. But it was the budget that we were able to negotiate, doing the very best job that we could, to take into consideration the variety of competing interests, and frankly we sweated blood over many of those competing interests, all of which will be reflected in the debate this afternoon, and that will be felt here on the floor.

So I just simply want to offer my strongest commendations to our leadership, to those who served on the committee, and to ask the strong support of the Members who will vote today, for one basic reason; and that is, that when you take a look at what the alternative is to voting for this budget resolution, higher and higher Federal spending: On the House version alone we will spend \$20 billion

less in the next 3 years if this budget resolution is passed.

That in itself is significant reason for us to vote aye when the time comes on this budget, because the alternative is putting us deeper and deeper into debt; something that I do not think there is anyone on this floor wants to see take place.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2475, SIMPLIFICATION OF IMPUTED INTEREST RULES

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2475) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to simplify the imputed interest rules of sections 1274 and 483, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOWARD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, this is the report on imputed interest, which all the Members of the House—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman withhold? This is the appointment of conferees, the Chair would state to the gentleman.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, this issue deals with imputed interest, which all the Members of the House are anxious to dispatch.

I had very strong objections to the procedures. The distinguished chairman has persuaded me that the way in which he is handling it is the most expeditious way to satisfy all of the Members of the body.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROSTENKOWSKI, GIBBONS, PICKLE, RANGEL, STARK, DUNCAN, ARCHER, and VANDER JAGT.

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER ON TODAY OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER, CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2475, SIMPLIFICATION OF IMPUTED INTEREST RULES

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time today or any day thereafter to consider the conference report on the bill, H.R. 2475, that all points of order against the conference report be waived, and that the conference report be considered as read when called up for consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, if it is in order, I would yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the gentlemen for yielding.

My colleagues, I think that our country is waiting for us to act on this deficit, and thanks to the persistence and the patience of our chairman, BILL GRAY, we have a budget, and it was not easy.

Many options were taken off the table right at the start; but we have a budget and we have a deficit reduction of \$56 billion.

Do I think the defense number is too high; I say to my friend from Massachusetts? Yes, I do.

□ 1930

But this House will have the opportunity to work its will on that number when we come back from recess and vote on the defense authorization conference. In this budget I think it is important for my colleagues to understand that we save programs for the very poor, we save transit, we save nutrition, we save Superfund, and we got a big deficit reduction. I urge support.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am appreciative genuinely of the very good work done by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who chairs the Budget Committee. I am delighted I voted for him. He was presented with a very difficult situation, given the extremism that existed at the White House, given the rigidity that existed elsewhere, in places the rules prohibit me from mentioning. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania did an excellent job, and I have no criticism to make of that. But I cannot vote for a final product which substantially increases not just this year but in the year after and the year after that, what we call the out years, but which normal people call next year and the year after, provides for a 3-percent increase in the military over and above inflation.

The people who have insisted on this, the President and a group to whom I cannot refer still have not gotten the message that we do not want to go along with increase after increase after increase in the military while the poorest of the poor are imposed upon.

This House turned down last week any significant vote of funds to house people who were desperately poor. We have a homelessness crisis, and we lament that homelessness crisis, and then we vote to cut funds for the des-

perately poor in public housing. Do Members think that the poor come periodically from Mars? Do they not understand where the poor come from? They come from people who do not have enough places to live. And we are denying them places to live because we have got a fund in next year and the year after, real growth in the tens of billions of dollars over and above what the Pentagon now has.

I want to make one little aside and allude to an earlier debate, because sometimes Members are sincere, but not always. We heard a great deal of lamentation and weeping before, over a bill that deals with potential sex discrimination in pay because the report was not ready in time. And Members on the other side were distraught that the report had only come out at 1 o'clock and here we are voting. We just had an explanation that the report on this bill will be ready in September. And the extent to which that has disarranged my friends on the other side is not visible to the naked eye or even to long-term software contact lenses. In other words, people who are prepared to vote for this wham-bam and thank you, under these circumstances, people who are prepared to vote without a report in this quickest of the quick, who then will allude again to the terrible problem about how rushed they are in pay equity, will have to search long and far before they will find anyone who will believe them.

So, please, spare us, having greased the skids, any lamentation about the lack of time on pay equity. You cannot vote after hours of debate, we are going to be told, on a commission to study the subject of sex discrimination, but you can pass a resolution covering the entire budget for the entire United States of America for 2 years to come, with a report that will be published in September, in about an hour and a half. So let us keep clear who is talking about what.

Now, let us go back to this budget question. The question is, as the gentleman from Ohio said to my friend from Iowa, don't you want to reduce the deficit? We do. If the only change—I would like an awful lot of changes, I say to my friends here—but if the only change were to be to cut that military number I would enthusiastically support this budget, as much as I dislike it. But in its current form, you are asking us to give an increase to the military so we can cut community development block grants and take a little bit more out of Medicare. And I understand that it was a sense of responsibility on the part of my friends on the Budget Committee who said, "Well, we cannot allow there to be no budget at all." I would not want there to be no budget at all. But continuing to feed the notion at the Pentagon that they can spend without

regard for the drain they levy on our resources is a mistake. And that is what this budget does.

So I would hope that we would reject this and ask that a conference reconvene and simply come back with a smaller military number. I would be satisfied with that. So let us isolate the question to the continued increase. We are told, "Well, wait a minute, this is just the authorization. The appropriation will be coming. The House will later work its will." Well, when the authorization came out on the military, the military authorization, people said, "Well, it is the budget that will control it." The budget people said, "It is the military authorization." And now they both say it is the appropriation. We are going from Winken to Blinken to Nod here, and I am afraid that there is not anywhere that we ever catch up with it. Each one is pointing to the other, and by the time we are through we are going to have \$300 billion voted for defense unnecessarily, and it is not going to be anybody's fault, it is going to be 6 other committees. By the time we are through, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is going to be blamed for continuing to bust the budget for the Pentagon.

Maybe we will get some clarification from people. I was glad to hear the chairman of the Appropriations Committee say he does not intend to be bulldogged on this. But we have a budget, with the best efforts of our negotiators, because of the people with whom they had to negotiate, because they apparently said, "If you do not continue to fuel the Pentagon," and we got this from the President and we got it from his colleagues elsewhere, and we are told, apparently, by others, "If you do not continue to feed the Pentagon and give them far more than anybody else in percentage terms, in real terms, in the out years, in the in years, everywhere you can, then there will be no budget."

I do not think we should give in to that kind of extortion by the Pentagon.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I have heard the remarks of my friend and colleague, a gentleman greatly respected in this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts. And I would say to him and to my colleagues who have been with me on so many battles in the past that if someone had come to you in January and said to you that we will have a budget that does not touch entitlements, that actually raises every poor person's program by inflation, that does not touch Social

Security, that does cut some domestic programs but in a way that all of our constituencies out there have said they can live with, because they have to bear some of the pain, and that came much closer to a freeze on defense—and I would remind the gentleman from Massachusetts that even the House-passed resolution was not to freeze, but much closer to a freeze than to the President's proposal—could we of this persuasion get that kind of budget? You would have said to me, "You're crazy. Take it if you can get it."

Well, the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, has endeavored and labored and worked hard, and he has gotten there. I say to my friend from Massachusetts he ordered his hamburger medium rare. The hamburger came back medium. And instead of eating the hamburger, he sent it back to the kitchen. And that is going to leave a lot of people hungry, because the next hamburger is going to be well done.

The fact of the matter is, as all of us know, we do not have a majority in the Senate that are of our political thinking; we do not have a person in the White House who is of our thinking; we do not even have a majority in this House that is of our thinking. And given all of that, we have done very, very well.

It is easy to vote "no" and walk away. But I can assure my colleagues, particularly my colleagues who believe in the programs that I believe in, that this is the best we can do with having a budget. And if we do not have a budget, we will do considerably worse for the things we believe in.

I wish to engage in a brief colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, is it true that reconciliation savings from public housing will cover financing only for those units which are currently in the pipeline?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. SCHUMER. And as I understand it, this change in financing was insisted upon by the Senate conferees and that the conferees agreed that if the contemplated savings are not achieved by this change, the Banking Committee will not be forced to make reductions in other programs.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. That is also correct.

Mr. SCHUMER. In other words, the reconciliation procedures will not under any circumstances require further reductions to be made in housing programs by the House Banking Committee.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the chairman.

□ 1940

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOULTER].

Mr. BOULTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a conferee, I just want to thank my chairman and my ranking minority member for not giving up. I strongly support this budget resolution.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the heroic efforts of the gentleman from Massachusetts in opposition to the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, here we are again. The House is considering a budget resolution after it has passed most of its appropriations bills. It is, regrettably, our custom to vote heroically for a budget resolution after we have spent most of the money.

The resolution does no bad. Neither did any of its predecessors. It is supposed to make great savings from the deficit baseline. So did its predecessors.

The resolution calls for a deficit reduction of \$55 billion. That's a bigger claim for savings than some previous budgets, but the Republic's path to outrageous deficits and debt has been paved with the same kinds of claims.

The resolution still contains unreal revenues. Not only is the growth assumption egregiously overstated at 4 percent, but the multibillion-dollar offshore oil revenue which everyone agrees cannot be achieved is still included. The administration has revalued its growth prediction to 3 percent, and the consensus of leading economist is even lower. I can't tell how much the revenue is inflated but surely the figure exceeds \$10 billion.

Expenses on the other hand are understated, often just as egregiously as revenues are overstated. Interest assumptions are even harder to pin down than growth rates. My judgment tells me our scenario is unreasonably optimistic.

Only once in the history has the Budget Act actually worked. The year was 1981. The fiscal year was 1982. The secret was reconciliation. One of the allegedly strong points of this resolution is that it has more reconciled savings than our original bill. But, only \$18 billion of the claimed spending reductions of over \$50 billion are reconciled.

But, worse than the small amount of reconciliation, I fear that committees of jurisdictions will not carry out their reconciliation instructions. The House has no way to enforce reconciliation, and the precedent is that it has tolerated, or even encouraged, noncompli-

ance. My own committee has plenty of room to maneuver without expense reductions, and is unlikely to reduce one dime of the costs within its jurisdiction. Other committees may be worse. They usually are.

And let us consider the defense function. Our brave managers have raised the House's budget authority by a mere \$10 billion. They have cleverly kept the outlay figure down, but that is pure illusion. Once budget authority is appropriated, it is always spent, and usually sooner than later.

I believe the defense figure is too high to encourage sound management. The public's lack of confidence in the Department of Defense did not occur out of thin air. Another increase this year will simply be a disincentive for the Pentagon to improve its procedures. The defense number is simply too high. It, like all the spending, is simply too much.

The dead giveaway that there is no intention to realize any actual saving is that committee allocations will not even be published until late in September. By then the House will have passed the rest of its appropriations bills. It is no act of rashness to predict another \$220 billion deficit for fiscal year 1986.

The other dead giveaway is the fact that the House has already appropriated \$19 billion more than its 1985 budget called for. History verifies the House's fiscal inclination. History also verifies the House's attempt to cover up its profligacy with unreal budgets.

I acknowledge the hard work of our managers. I admit the resolution is better than the House's first resolution. But I charge that it is inadequate, that it is a continuation of the old shell game. I wish I could take it seriously, but I cannot.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this budget calls for higher spending, not lower spending. It proposes a \$21.3 billion increase in fiscal year 1986. Adjusting for inaccurate assumptions, the measure will result in a \$40 to \$50 billion increase. Tax revenues in the resolution are overestimated by \$10 to \$30 billion. In reality this budget resolution does not make significant reductions in our deficit. It ignores the problems rather than solving them.

Some have said that it is all we can pass. I don't accept that. Our Nation and our freedoms are too important to be allowed to be drowned in a sea of red ink.

Who here can honestly say that we cannot go 1 year without increasing spending? We can and we must do better than condemn our country and

our people to economic stagnation brought on by ever-rising Federal deficits.

The bottom line is that Congress needs to reduce the deficit. This budget plan assumes savings that are not there, revenue that will not materialize and deficit reduction that is imaginary.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG].

Mr. GREGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to rise with others and congratulate the Budget Committee on their hard work. But I must take some exception to the final product. Although we have not had a great deal of time to study this issue, it does seem to me that the only substantive and hard cut in this budget, not the only one, but one of the few, is defense.

In fact, if you look at the economic assumptions, it looks like, as the gentleman from Colorado just mentioned, that there is at least a \$20 billion overestimate in taxes. There is about an \$8 billion estimate of savings and income security, and one has to wonder how that can occur when you are already adding within the categories of income security \$400 million for the nutrition program, and there are no other cuts in the income security area.

There is also an assumption that agriculture will be reduced by approximately \$8 billion. Now, I think that anybody who has been on this floor over the last few months and watched what has happened when agricultural bills have come to this floor has to conclude that that assumption is hopeful at best.

It appears to me that as I look at this, that what this budget does is basically maintain the deficit at \$200 or \$200-plus billion. It is, unfortunately, illusory. At best it is a Band-Aid over an open wound in an artery, and we need a tourniquet on that artery.

We simply cannot afford to put off and thus amplify what will definitely be a day of reckoning if we do not act affirmatively on the budget at this time, and make some substantial cuts, not only in the defense area, but also in the social spending areas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will inform the Members that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] has 9 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] has 10 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACKEY].

Mr. MACKEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I speak for a group and I speak to a group who supported the Leath amendment, who may them-

selves think that this has not gone far enough. Certainly, that has been expressed by Mr. BROWN and Mr. GREGG.

I would say to them only this: That this issue is moving very rapidly. The issue we have to face tonight is whether our conferees got all that we could get this time. I believe that we are not at the end; we are at the beginning of this issue. I believe we will be back and I urge an affirmative vote on this. Our choice is this or nothing. I think nothing is not acceptable.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN].

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the conference is finally over. Most of us were under 25 years old when it started, and we are quite grateful to be here tonight. The leadership in this conference deserve the credit they are getting.

May I point how varied the conferees were. There are the redneck radicals from the right, such as myself. Liberals. The other body, for whom it was often distasteful to sit with any of us, I suspect. People with strong ties to unions; people who believe that America should be run like a business, and yet somehow a majority of these people unwillingly have come together to say we believe you should vote for this conference.

Parents always love their children; it is one of the great miracles, because sometimes a person's babies are not terribly attractive. As a politician, you cannot tell a parent, "Good grief, that kid has got your uncle's nose and it looks dreadful." Or, "For heaven's sake, the child looks as if it is already 80 years old; send it back." In fact, one learns to look at this child that the parents adore and say, "My, what an interesting-looking baby."

I would suggest to you that this is a very interesting-looking budget. That it is not beautiful, that it is not one that through the years will be held up as an ideal, but it is still produced, a baby, that should have its life, and should be supported.

It does not have what I want in it. It does not have nearly enough. Its parameters were too narrow. The egos were often too great, and it is still the best we could do and, frankly, better than I thought we would ever get 4 months ago.

It is not a great "yes" vote, but a "no" vote is totally irresponsible for the future.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Massachusetts yield me an additional minute?

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank both gentlemen for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to lend my voice to those who were saying that the responsible vote is an "aye" vote for this budget conference report. I would like to direct my colleagues who have some doubt, some question about whether or not we have stood behind the domestic spending programs that I know are so essential to the economic recovery and the personal health and safety of so many areas and individuals.

There is no question that when this budget was introduced this year, it was a blueprint for the demolition of the domestic state of this country. We have not gone along with that blueprint. There were 22 programs proposed for elimination; we have only eliminated 6. UDAG grants, Community Development Block Grants, EDA, Tennessee Valley, Appalachian Regional Commission still exist, agreed, at lower levels, to help the people of those areas who need it desperately.

Veterans programs have been maintained. Mr. FORB would indicate his support for this bill because we have not interfered with his committee's oversight responsibilities in Federal retirement. We have, I think, acted responsibly in the context of continuing. I am afraid, the process of dismantling domestic programs. We had cut some \$176 billion prior to this year under the Reagan administration in domestic programs; we continue that.

We had added \$112 billion in defense, and I am afraid we continue that, but we do it in the most modest way. In addition, we have kept the Appropriations Committee's ability to make the changes that it understands to be basic and fundamental.

I ask with all that in consideration for an "aye" vote.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

□ 1950

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the litany of praise for Chairman GRAY and the work that he has done in bringing this budget through the maze that it has followed over many months and for preserving a number of programs that are important to the fabric of our society and to the structure of our economy.

The issue is not whether BILL GRAY has done a good job or not. The basic issue is whether or not this House should agree to a budget resolution that treats defense spending far more favorably than nondefense spending.

The conference agreement makes no cuts whatsoever in defense spending when we measure that item on the same scale as cuts in nondefense

spending. All of the deficit reduction contained in the conference agreement comes from making further cuts in domestic programs, \$10 billion more in defense, and nothing in this budget resolution says where we are going to pay for it. How are we going to cover that?

Instead, we are told that this issue will be put off when we consider the conference agreement on the military budget or when we take up the appropriation bill on military spending. That is the wrong forum in which to make this decision. That issue should be decided here in the context of this conference report on this budget where that issue ought to be debated.

The purpose of a budget is to resolve the matter of priorities, of national priorities that we want for this country. The House should not capitulate now on the theory that we can fight this issue out later in the appropriations process. That pushes it off to the wrong forum at the wrong time in the wrong decisionmaking process. Now is the time to say "no" to the largest increase in military spending we have had in the history of this country. This is the wrong budget at the wrong time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, having lost the war, we are declaring victory and going home.

The conference report presented is too little and far too late. The budget agreement that has emerged from the conference is 2½ months after deadline. And it claims to include savings which are hollow, meaningless, and not backed by binding reconciliation.

About 2 weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, eyeball to eyeball, both sides of the conference committee blinked and approved spending increases for both defense and Social Security. This tentative agreement, confirmed tonight, tightens and screws on our children who will have to pay these further deficits this Congress is about to pile on them.

In January of this year, as part of a comprehensive plan to drastically reduce the Federal deficit, I called for an across-the-board budget freeze as a first step. The response from my constituents was overwhelmingly favorable. Many Social Security recipients wrote me saying that they would willingly accept a COLA freeze if Congress also froze defense spending and all other Federal functions.

Unfortunately, the conference did not have the guts to truly tackle the monster on runaway Federal spending. Instead, what they have placed before the House is only a few bricks in the rubble of the budget process. That process has actually worked only once

since it was established 11 years ago; 1981 was the only year this body had the courage to adopt full binding reconciliation. Unfortunately, this budget, like almost all the others, fails to include significant binding reconciliation, and the savings shown will evaporate as they have so often before.

Furthermore, the lateness of this budget make it largely irrelevant. Waiting and waiting for budget courage, the Appropriations Committee finally went ahead with the appropriations process without a budget and has already completed action on the majority of its bills. What are we supposed to do, go back and rewrite them with only 20 working days before the end of the fiscal year? The only purpose a vote in favor of this resolution will serve is to falsely justify the last 6 months of wasted time spent on a measure rammed through the House at the last possible moment after all the significant cuts had been compromised and stripped away.

Mr. Speaker, many, however, have worked hard on the package and do deserve praise and I commend the House Republicans, particularly, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] for their hard work. My greatest praise, however, I must reserve for my Republican colleagues in the other body and especially its exemplary majority leader, for their truly courageous efforts to solve America's deficit crisis. If we are ever to save our children's economic future, we will need to make the kind of hard choices they were willing to make.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is this: The "compromise" agreed to in this resolution was "I get mine and you get yours" and the kids get the bill.

The two largest items, defense and Social Security, each get substantial increases over the 3-year period and the remaining functions supposedly will carry the burden of the deficit reduction claimed, but there is little reconciliation to force them to do so.

When the appropriation process finally ends, little actual savings will have been achieved and huge deficits will remain which will be passed on to our children to bear, their legacy from a Congress, like so many others which preceded it, unable to show the courage, unwilling to make the hard choices needed to protect them.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, just to keep the record straight, let us not confuse the figures. Defense is taking more out of these cuts in this proposal than any other function. It represents one-third of the budget, taking half of the cuts.

Actually, there is \$27.5 billion being taken out of 050. Did the gentleman understand that—\$27.5 billion? How much is coming out of nondefense, dis-

cretionaries? The figure happens to be \$22.3 billion.

So let us not confuse the figures. Let us have them straight.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond to the gentleman from Ohio that \$27 billion is not coming out of anything except Caspar Weinberger's fantasy. The reason they can talk about how much they are reducing it is that they pumped it up so incredibly that it looks like six incredible hulks.

If you measure it in a rational way from what has been spent, in fact it is going to get great increases and great increases and great increases.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania yields 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], a member of the committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, and Members, first of all I, too, would like to commend the chairman of this committee because it is very clear under the circumstances in which we had to operate, with the intervention of the White House, the missteps in the Senate, I do not believe there is another chairman in this House who could have pulled this budget together in the fair and equitable fashion that Chairman GRAY did. I think we all owe him a great deal of indebtedness, whether or not we are going to vote for this budget. I think he has made the House proud and I think he has provided the kind of leadership that has allowed the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] and others to work with this in a fashion that we have never seen before.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope my colleagues would vote for this budget. It provides for protection and for increases for poor people's programs. If you do not like the defense figure, the first week in September you will get to come back and vote on the authorization bill and the amendment to cut it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] has 7 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] has 2 minutes and 40 seconds remaining.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP].

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said before but it needs to be said again that there is no more controversial, no more comprehensive economic statement that we are going to make in this body than that which we make tonight.

It is impossible to get a compromise in which we can have people on both sides of the aisle and both sides of Capitol Hill all agreeing on everything. I want to say, as the previous speaker, a partisan Democrat, said in paying tribute to Chairman GRAY, let me say to my colleagues on the conservative side of the aisle that it would have been absolutely impossible to reach a compromise, to reach a budget that can bring down the deficit to 2½ percent of GNP by 1988, to bring down the deficit by \$57.5 billion in 1986, or almost \$280 billion over 3 years had it not been for the efforts of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTI) and the efforts of the gentleman from New Mexico, the chairman PETE DOMENICI.

But the Congress is not run by DEL LATTI or PETE DOMENICI; it is run by those of us on both sides of the aisle who have very strong feelings about defense, as this Member does, as does Mr. LATTI and the members of our committee.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania deserves credit and I want to stand up here publicly and tell my colleagues, as one who has been working with him over a number of weeks and months, he has kept his word, he has worked hard, he has been fair, he has been straight, he has protected programs that were important to the poor, to the handicapped, to the indigent, to the cities, while at the same time recognizing that there were things on our side of the aisle that were incredibly important not just to the Republicans but to the White House.

This has been an incredible experience. This is the first budget where I have stood up in the well of the House and felt emotionally or subjectively that I wanted to support it, and I want to say to my colleagues, if you are not for raising taxes or cutting Social Security, you have no reason to oppose this compromise. If you want to cut Social Security, if you want to cut the COLA's, if you want to raise taxes, if you want to balance the budget off the backs of the working men and women of America or the poor, then vote against it.

But if you believe responsibly in bringing about a budget compromise that unites the center right and the center left of the political spectrum, then it seems to me you owe it to yourself and your community and your country and the economy, the people you represent, to join those of us on both sides of the aisle from different political parties, at different ends of the Capitol, to support it.

□ 2000

I want to emphasize one thing once again. There is \$57 billion of deficit savings, with strong efforts made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and other leaders of the Democratic Party to give us on the Republican side what

we think is important, enforcement procedures and reconciliation—not everything that we wanted, nor did we give everything that they wanted to the other side.

This is a very important statement to the financial markets that we are serious about bringing down the deficit, which is about 4½ to 5 percent of GNP today, down to about 2½ percent of GNP over the next 3 years, with any luck at all from the Central Bank of the United States which could be and should be lowering its interest rates in the short term and midrange right now.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEMP. I would be glad to yield to my friend from Michigan, who has had such an important contribution to make by being one of the leaders of the 92 Group.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) for his statement tonight. No budget could be a disaster tonight. We need this budget. I do not think there are \$55 billion of real savings here; I think it is more like 38 or 39, but that is a step in the right direction. I want to credit the Group 92 for putting a budget here with hard numbers approved by CBO, delivered and introduced on time. And to my task force, I want to congratulate them for being constructive and trying to build that coalition to achieve our national goals, addressing the deficit.

Mr. KEMP. I want to say to my friend from Michigan that I totally agree with his statement about the responsibility of the 92 Group for helping fashion the final product, but I want to assure him, from this gentleman's standpoint and that of other Members of the Republican Party who served with him on his budget, all of us are convinced there is a lot more than \$38 billion here, and with any luck at all, with a little more growth and lower interest rates, we are going to have a much better budget picture in 1986, much better than has been predicted by those who say the sky is falling and we are going to hell in a handbasket. We are not unless we let it happen, and what Chairman GRAY and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. DEL LATTI, have helped us to do is to make sure that we pass a policy choice here tonight that can help us move in the right direction.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that much agonizing and many hours of work have gone into the budget conference report. I would like to commend the conferees for their effort and the production of a conference report prior to the recess.

In closely following the budget process this year as chairman of the 92 Group's Task Force on the Budget, in which we developed a budget of our

own, it also is evident that in the House-passed budget resolution and in this conference report there are contained many of the proposals that the 92 Group Budget Task Force worked out over 4 months of lengthy deliberations and that were contained in the 92 Group's budget plan, "A Blueprint for Balance." That plan, an early historic document in that it was the only budget, I might add, that was introduced into the House in compliance with the time parameters of the Budget Act, was—in the opinion of the 92 Group—the most fair and equitable way to accomplish what should be our No. 1 priority, reducing the Federal deficit. I would like to commend the 92 Group Budget Task Force for its tireless work and the hard political decisions its members made in adopting the document, a document which represents a spirit of open-mindedness and constructive compromise.

I would also like to commend the House Budget Committee and the budget conferees for recognizing the value of and real and attainable savings contained in the 92 Group budget resolution and for incorporating its proposals into their documents.

Personally, and somewhat reluctantly, I rise in support of the budget conference report. My reluctance stems from reservations which the 92 Group of House Republicans and which I have concerning the report: First, its high defense budget authority figure and the lack of linkage between defense budget authority and outlay numbers. The conference report takes the other body's budget authority figure of \$302.5 billion and the House outlay figure of \$293.5 billion. Even if you take into account an apparent slowing in spend-out rates at the Pentagon, outlays still are a function of not only past years' budget authority figures but current year's as well. I'm not sure that the relationship contained in the conference report is valid. As for the higher defense budget authority number—some \$10 billion higher than what this body approved in the House-passed defense authorization—we plan to fight that out on the floor when the defense authorization conference report and defense appropriations bills are considered, to try to keep defense spending at, or as close as possible to a freeze level; second, we are concerned about the lack of specifics Members have in their hands in terms of the policy guidelines that achieve the projected outlay savings contained in the conference report. It is unfortunate that this is the case. Because of that, we are considering a budget for its own sake. But, certainly, it does contain some savings. It does contain some guidelines. But how real those savings are, at this point, we don't know. That is unfortunate.

We in the 92 Group were conscientious about having the Congressional Budget Office analyze all our outlay savings proposals. We have real, attainable, and credible savings in the 92 Group budget proposal. For credibility is of the utmost importance if guidelines are to be followed. But, in the interest of providing at least some guidelines and of showing the American people we are concerned about deficit reduction, at this late hour, and despite the reservations I've expressed, I ask the support of the Members of this House for the budget conference report and urge its approval.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEMP. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to join him in his commendations of Chairman GRAY and DEL LATTA and also Senator DOMENICI on the other side. But I also want to say to colleagues that the gentleman in the well deserves a great deal of credit for what is happening right now.

Mr. KEMP. I do not want to lose any votes on the left side of the aisle.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I think without the work of the gentleman, we might not have been here tonight.

Mr. KEMP. I appreciate the words of my friend, the gentleman from California.

Let me just conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that BILL GRAY deserves not only the thanks but the admiration of every Member on both sides of the aisle, as does DEL LATTA, and I thank them both for the pleasure of working with them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] has 2 minutes and 40 seconds remaining.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself just 10 seconds to say that I now understand what the word, "reconciliation" means in the budget process, because we have just seen the reconciliation of the gentleman from New York and the senior Senator from Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Before saying anything further, I would like to join my colleagues in commending Chairman GRAY for a good job and a hard job. But I regretfully rise in opposition to this budget.

If there is going to be \$57 billion in savings in outlays, they are only going to be achieved with a lower budget authority figure in defense. Otherwise the figure that is being used is a promise that cannot be kept.

A yes vote tonight, while it may seem responsible, will open the door

for losing this opportunity for saving the money we have to save this year and in the years to come. The plain fact is that this budget resolution, by giving in completely to the Senate on budget authority, makes the only real decision with respect to the defense spending. It is a decision that we are going to regret in the future if we do not make a strong statement against it tonight.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], a member of the committee.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the budget, a product that I believe this House can be proud of. It gives us the opportunity to demonstrate tonight that this House can govern, that it can pass a budget, and that it can answer the pleas of the country that we get on with the country's business.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise not only to pay tribute to the chairman of my Budget Committee, but also to indicate my desire to vote with him.

I do so for three principal reasons, and I think this is one point that has not been made this evening. That is that the conference committee report recommends a spending level for next year of \$6 billion less than what the President asked the Congress to spend. Not only that, there is about \$30 billion less than what the President requested over the next 3 years.

The next point that I think has not been emphasized is the fact that this conference committee report recommends a deficit of \$50 billion less than what the President wanted when he offered his budget to the Congress.

Those points need to be made and made clear to the American public because the Congress is making an effort to get spending under control, and I believe this conference committee report is a great step in the right direction.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] has expired.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman for 30 additional seconds.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, the last point I would like to make to my colleagues on the left who are concerned about the level of defense spending is this: let me just remind them that we are talking about spending ceilings, not spending floors. We will have an opportunity to come back here and vote on that defense level and determine whether we are going

to spend \$292.5 billion or whether we are going to spend \$303 billion. Let us keep that in mind. We are talking about spending ceilings, not spending floors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] has a minute and a half remaining.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, if the question here were on the capacity and integrity of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. BILL GRAY, whom we all respect and admire, this budget would pass unanimously; but it is not on him that we will be voting. It is on the issue itself. It is on the budget.

I voted for the budget the first time around. But as it has re-emerged from conference budget it is really a betrayal of everything we have been talking about. We are talking about a budget which, because of the \$10 billion defense increase, is going to be driving the domestic programs for the poor and for the middle class to be cut this year and next year and the year after. Before long, we will be asked to take that \$10 billion out of the hides of the American people.

We do not have to play Ronald Reagan's game of destroying essential programs enacted for the benefit of the people of this country. We should not be doing it. We ought to vote no on this budget. Let's defeat it. Then let the Budget Committee come back with one that does service to the American people. In that way we will be doing our job properly.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report, and I would like also to compliment the very able chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA], the ranking minority member, and especially the gentleman from Texas, Mr. MARVIN LEATH, who is a former member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for his work. I commend the other members of the conference committee as well.

The Nation's veterans have been treated fairly, in my opinion, in this budget report. Let me say as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that we will have to find \$1.1 billion in savings over 3 years, and this is not smoke and mirrors. But I think we can find these savings without really hurting the basic benefits for veterans and their dependents.

The numbers that have come back in function 700 for veterans are close to the numbers that passed in the House, and I again want to commend

the conferees for that. The veterans have been protected in this conference report, and I stand here fully in support of this report.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WEAVER].

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the budget resolution before the House is a charade, a farce; it would be comic if it were not tragic. I do not blame the House Budget Committee and its chairman. Only three areas exist in which the staggering, gruesome, obscene deficits can be dealt with. They are the military, Social Security, and taxes. The House has refused to touch Social Security, the other body and the President refused to deal with the military, and the President refuses to deal with taxes. So the Budget Committee never had a chance.

We are heading for disaster, for a collapse in our economy, a depression that will make the 1930's look like a garage sale. Our pathetic attempts to deal with the gross idiocy of the deficits only illuminate the tragic scene about to occur in our great Nation.

The real culprit in the budget debacle is the President. He refuses to deal with reality and is living in economic fantasy. His refusal to pay for the military spending he has exploded into the atmosphere of this country is the single most devastating policy to come from the White House in our era.

When the Republican leadership of the other body brought forth an oil import fee and other aspects which in their small way attempted to deal with reality, the President torpedoed those leaders of his own party.

I vote against this budget resolution because I refuse to endorse the charade, the falseness, the unreality inside it, wrapped in a ribbon of rhetoric though it be.

□ 2010

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining 30 seconds to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, we are operating under a budget now, we adopted it 2 weeks ago. The question tonight is, Should we substitute the budget before you for the budget we are now operating under? Both budget resolutions call for practically the same amount of cuts, \$56 billion or \$57 billion in 1986.

The question is, Which one do you prefer? This one increases the military function \$10 billion, takes it out of other programs, including Medicare, agriculture, small business, and several other programs. It also means abandoning the concept of a freeze on no more than the 1985 level.

I say that we would be better off under the resolution we are now operating under. The Appropriations Committee has been operating under it now for 3 weeks. We have done a pretty good job and let us not change in the middle of the stream here and go to a budget resolution that I think is inferior to what we now have.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT].

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to start off by commending the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee. The fact of the matter is whether you agree with what he has done in this product here tonight, he has handled this whole process masterfully and I admire the work he had done.

I also want to commend our ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA], for the work he has done and the conferees for the work they have done in the last 3 days.

The truth of the matter is the conference on this budget resolution did not even begin until 3 days ago. If our friends in the other body had gotten down to serious negotiations in the trenches, where they should have been, giving and taking a little bit a month ago, we could have done this before now and we might have gotten a much better budget resolution; but in spite of that, I think a good job has been done. Oh, it is not everything I would like to have. From my viewpoint, I think it cuts too much out of defense and it does not cut enough out of domestic spending programs, but we have got a pretty good budget here tonight and I urge my colleagues on this side of the aisle, on both sides of the aisle, to vote for it.

Have you noticed tonight across the aisle on both sides we have people that agree and disagree, Republicans and Democrats. Do you know what that indicates to me? It is probably a pretty good budget. We have a got a chance here for the first time in a long time, maybe the first time, to have a genuinely bipartisan budget resolution. Let us not miss that opportunity.

Now, what are the options? What if we defeat this here tonight? How silly are we going to seem if we walk away from this, throw our hands up in the air and go home and say, "Well, what the heck, it wasn't all I wanted, so I said, no, thanks."

I will tell you what some of the options are—no budget resolution, the collapse of the budget process and when we come back some of you that think that it does not cut enough out of defense, well, it may go the other way from what you think.

One of the options will be that some of our friends around the city might say, "Well, wait a minute. Maybe we ought to do something with Social Security."

Again, how many times are we going to hear that? How many times is that going to be back on the table?

So to my friends on this side of the aisle, you think tax increases are gone for the rest of the year or forever? Forget it. If we do not pass the budget resolution here tonight, let me tell you, tax increases are going to be back on the table.

It is time to get serious about this. It does do some good things. There are \$68 billion in reconciliation here. That is more than we had in the House resolution when it originally passed. It only had \$37 billion. That is more than the gentleman from Ohio had in his original bill; so there are real reconciliation savings here.

There are other features that are good. It terminates four programs. It ought to terminate a lot more, but it terminates four. It reduces outlays for Medicare. It eliminates some of the phony savings; so there are real important things here, but the important thing, in my opinion, is if we walk away from this, what is the perception? The perception will be very negative, that we could not do it.

Some people say, well, it is not \$55 billion or \$56 billion in savings, it is only \$39 billion. The last time I checked buckets on the Mississippi, \$39 billion was not chicken feed. I would rather have \$39 billion in savings than no savings; so think about the perception, what it does to the financial markets.

Also, most importantly, think about the economy and if you are thinking about the economy, adopt this budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the people that have worked to get us this far tonight.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, let me add my voice to those who have praised the gentleman from Pennsylvania, BILL GRAY, for a job well done. He has done this job as well as it can be done.

Mr. Speaker, if you are thinking of voting against this budget, just think of two things that this vote means. First, if you vote against the conference report, you are saying that you are in favor of a deficit for 1986 of \$229 billion, rather than one of \$171 billion; and by 1988 you are willing to have a deficit of \$244 billion, instead of a deficit of \$112 billion. That is what the vote is about.

Second, it is about faith. If we do not pass this budget tonight, people all over the world and all over this country are going to lose faith in where our economy is going. We have a \$150 billion trade deficit. The Third World countries that are in debt to the

United States hang in the balance on whether or not we pass this budget. The American people and others are lending their support to this.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], a former member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the budget resolution and obviously join in commending both sides for the work that was done here, particularly Chairman GRAY for the work that he did.

No one questions that we face a major crisis in the deficit. We are bleeding. It is a cancer that is bleeding and bleeding badly and if it is allowed to continue, frankly, it is going to destroy all our priorities.

This resolution is not a cure for that cancer, no one is saying that it is; but when you are bleeding badly, you need first aid. You need a tourniquet and this resolution is a step in that direction to try to protect some of the priorities we care about and to try to achieve some of the savings.

I wish the White House had joined with the Congress in developing a common package to deal with this problem that faces taxes, faces entitlements, and faces defense. That did not happen; so we tried to work with the resolution that the leadership in the Congress was able to put together.

It is precisely because this is a crisis that we cannot afford to walk away from this resolution, because if we walk away from this resolution, we walk away from that crisis.

Support the budget resolution.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, to close out the debate on this issue, I yield the balance of the time to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], the majority leader, the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one point?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that this budget resolution does include full funding for 1986 for revenue sharing. I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the other members of the committee for arranging that. That is very important.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

This is not a perfect resolution, Mr. Speaker. In an imperfect world, by imperfect creatures, we deal with imperfect works. Just so, we have an imperfect resolution in the sense that it does not satisfy anyone completely, and yet it happens to be the very best that we could achieve under the circumstances.

Let us just ask ourselves if it is not a lot better than inaction. This budget resolution, achieved through the bipartisan cooperation to a degree that I have never seen before on a budget resolution in the entire history of this process, reduces the deficit projected by President Reagan by \$57 billion for the coming fiscal year and by some \$279 billion in the next 3 fiscal years.

Now, those reductions in deficits are worth securing, if you believe as I believe that it is just fundamentally dishonest and wrong to continue to live on a credit card economy, piling upon the backs of our children and grandchildren the responsibility of paying for things that we will have used up and worn out before they came of age.

□ 2020

Yes, it would have been nice, highly desirable, if we had been able to achieve greater deficit reductions. Bear in mind, however, that we have achieved these by the historic process of consensus. We have achieved them without breaking our promise to the Social Security recipients or any of the other retirees of this country.

We have achieved them without increasing taxes or adding any new taxes.

We have done so without yielding to some of the demands on the part of the other body that we should impose such things as user fees upon first-term purchasers of homes, or that we would make it more difficult for young Americans of modest economic circumstances to get a college education.

We have done it by freezing domestic spending, by very nearly freezing military spending, allowing a modest \$15 billion increase next year over this year's expenditure level.

I know there are some who feel that \$302 billion is too much. But let me suggest this: These figures are ceilings. There is no requirement that the ceilings be reached. The requirement simply is that they may not be breached, and it is altogether possible that in that level of spending, and in other levels of spending we may be able to achieve still greater reductions.

If we do so while still maintaining our compassion and our responsibility to those less fortunate in our society, as the chairman and the ranking minority member and the members of our committee have insisted they do, then we will have performed a service worthy to be remembered. And we will have performed a service to our particular time and our particular moment of history.

For those reasons I urge that we vote resoundingly for this resolution.

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this conference report on the budget resolution for fiscal 1986. I realize the heroic efforts made by the conferees, and I commend Chairman GRAY for his attempts

to achieve a budget that slows the growth of our budget deficits without hurting many vitally important programs.

We all know what the problem is—the deficit. We all know there are no easy answers and no perfect answers. I believe the issue that we must vote on today is whether this conference report is an acceptable answer to our budget problems. Many Members have said that, although this budget is not perfect, the responsible thing to do is to vote for the budget that the conference has reported. On the contrary, I believe that the responsible vote is to reject this conference report and its \$10 billion increase for defense.

Since the beginning of this year, a bipartisan group of Members concerned about the deficit has advocated an across-the-board freeze as the first step toward dealing with the deficit problem. A freeze would only slow the growth of the deficit, but it seems the only practical answer to our problems. I have voted on more than dozen occasions this year to freeze budget authority and appropriations in fiscal 1986 at the 1985 level. These have been hard choices, votes cast against programs I believe in.

The House has also voted on numerous occasions to freeze spending at this year's level. On May 23, 1985, I joined the majority of my colleagues in supporting the first budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 152. This House budget resolution would freeze fiscal 1986 defense spending at the fiscal 1985 level of \$292.6 billion. The House upheld this position when it voted 301 to 115 to reduce the defense authorization bill by \$10 billion in order to bring it into line with the House budget resolution.

Recently, when it seemed that conflicts between the Senate and the President might prevent passage of a legally binding budget, we in the House took the extraordinary step of voting to make the budget resolution we passed in May binding upon all of our appropriations bills. This vote reaffirmed yet again our commitment to freezing spending.

Despite these demonstrations of House intent, this budget conference report permits budget authority for defense spending to increase to \$302 billion in fiscal 1986. There is no way of getting around the fact that this money will eventually be spent, and that the defense budget will continue to increase faster than inflation in the outyears.

This increase in defense spending runs counter to several House-passed amendments in the defense authorization bill including: funding cuts of \$3.2 billion for 22 weapons systems, an additional \$1.2 billion in funding cuts for 12 MX missiles that the House decided were not needed to keep our country

secure, and restrictions on funding for R&D activities relating to the strategic defense initiative.

Iowans of all political beliefs have told me that they support an across-the-board budget freeze which includes the military. I therefore reluctantly oppose this budget. ●

● Mr. DROGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today reluctantly, to vote for passage of the budget resolution. I voted against every other budget package brought before the House because some of those budgets contained inflated savings. As a certified public accountant, I did not feel that I could support such budgets. Today's budget contains similarly inflated savings. However, as an American, I could not return to my constituents and tell them that we in Congress had failed in our primary duty.

This budget contains no cuts in the Social Security Program, other retirement programs, or tax increases. If it did, I would vote against it.

This is the first step on a long road toward fiscal sanity. It is a hesitant step but one that must be taken. I do not support the cuts in mass transit embodied in this budget and the cuts in many programs vital to the people of my district, such as community development block grants. I am sure, however, that many other Congressmen will vote for this package in spite of the cuts that it contains which injure their constituents. This is not the best program, but it is much better than no program at all. The Nation stands at a precipice and must take a step back. I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the long hours they put in to produce this document. Thank you Mr. Speaker. ●

● Mr. GROTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the conference report on the first concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1986. A dark cloud that has been hanging over the Capitol for the last few months is lifting now, as we pass this budget resolution. This is certainly probably the toughest budget compromise any Congress has ever had to hammer out since the inception of the Budget Act more than a decade ago. I congratulate the conferees, all of them, from both sides of the aisle and both Chambers in the Congress for their hard work and perseverance. The conference agreement is a fair one—no one is too unfairly gouged.

Specifically, I am pleased that \$55 billion in hard budget cuts for fiscal year 1986 is achieved in this agreement. Second, the conferees have agreed to the Senate numbers for the defense function, allowing for 0-3-3 percent real growth during fiscal years 1986-87-88. Third, no changes have been made in the conference report dealing with cost-of-living adjustments for retirement programs. Fourth, as

far as domestic cuts are concerned, I am pleased that the following has been accomplished by the conferees: Small Business Administration: \$2.5 billion in savings—similar to the savings contained in the House Small Business Committee's reauthorization of the Small Business Administration; Amtrak: 15 percent cut in fiscal year 1986 as opposed to a 40-percent cut in the Senate-passed resolution achieved by fiscal year 1988; civilian pay: a 1-year pay freeze for Federal employees, saving \$5 billion in fiscal year 1986; general revenue sharing: full funding for fiscal year 1986; termination of the program in fiscal year 1987; postal subsidies: 14 percent cut, instead of elimination as contained in the original Senate-passed version; and farm programs: \$7.9 billion in cuts, versus \$14.5 billion in Senate resolution.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the conferees have not approved any further taxes. We are not at the "last resort" yet, more spending cuts are needed. The conference report has teeth in it—the reconciliation process is alive and strong. I urge my colleagues to vote with me in support of this concurrent resolution. The voters in my district did not send me to Congress to do anything but reduce the \$200 billion Federal budget deficits. This is a good start. ●

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I would like to commend the conferees on their successful completion of the conference on the first concurrent budget resolution. We all know the hard work and difficult choices involved in that endeavor. I am particularly pleased that the conferees have achieved for our Nation's veterans a budget that is very close to that passed by the House of Representatives. This restatement of our commitment to these brave men and women will be appreciated throughout our country. ●

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] that the House recede from its amendment to Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 and concur with an amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry. Is this the motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. This is on the adoption of the motion to recede and concur.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 309, nays 119, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—309

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Ackerman | Erdreich | MacKay |
| Akaka | Evans (IL) | Manton |
| Alexander | Fascell | Martin (IL) |
| Andrews | Fazio | Martin (NY) |
| Annunzio | Feighan | Martinez |
| Anthony | Fiedler | Matsui |
| Aspin | Fish | Mavroules |
| Atkins | Flippo | Mazzoli |
| AuCoin | Foley | McCain |
| Badham | Ford (MI) | McCloskey |
| Barnard | Ford (TN) | McCollum |
| Barnes | Fowler | McCurdy |
| Bartlett | Franklin | McDade |
| Bateman | Frost | McEwen |
| Beilenson | Fuqua | McHugh |
| Bennett | Gallo | McKernan |
| Bentley | Gejdenson | McKinney |
| Berman | Gekas | McMillan |
| Bevill | Gephardt | Meyers |
| Biaggi | Gibbons | Mica |
| Billrakis | Gingrich | Michel |
| Billiey | Glickman | Michulski |
| Boehlert | Goodling | Miller (CA) |
| Boggs | Gordon | Mineta |
| Boland | Gray (PA) | Moakley |
| Boner (TN) | Groberg | Mollinari |
| Bonior (MI) | Guarini | Mollohan |
| Bonker | Hall (OH) | Monson |
| Borski | Hall, Ralph | Montgomery |
| Boucher | Hamilton | Moody |
| Boulter | Hammerschmidt | Moore |
| Boxe | Hansen | Moorhead |
| Breaux | Hatcher | Morrison (WA) |
| Brooks | Hawkins | Murtha |
| Broomfield | Heftel | Natcher |
| Broyhill | Hendon | Neal |
| Bruce | Henry | Nichols |
| Bryant | Hiler | Nielson |
| Burton (CA) | Hillis | Nowak |
| Burton (IN) | Holt | O'Brien |
| Bustamante | Horton | Oskar |
| Byron | Howard | Obey |
| Callahan | Hoyer | Olin |
| Campbell | Hubbard | Ortiz |
| Carney | Huckaby | Oxley |
| Chandler | Hughes | Packard |
| Chappell | Hunter | Panetta |
| Cheney | Hutto | Parris |
| Clinger | Hyde | Pashayan |
| Coats | Ireland | Pepper |
| Cobey | Jeffords | Pickle |
| Coble | Jenkins | Price |
| Coelho | Johnson | Pursell |
| Coleman (MO) | Jones (NC) | Quillen |
| Coleman (TX) | Jones (OK) | Rahall |
| Combest | Jones (TN) | Rangel |
| Conte | Kaptur | Ray |
| Cooper | Kasich | Reid |
| Coughlin | Kemp | Richardson |
| Courter | Kennelly | Ridge |
| Coyne | Kindness | Rinaldo |
| Daniel | Kiecza | Ritter |
| Darden | Kolbe | Robinson |
| Daschle | Kolter | Roe |
| Daub | Kostmayer | Roemer |
| Davis | Lagomarsino | Rogers |
| de la Garza | Lantos | Rose |
| Derrick | Latta | Rostenkowski |
| DeWine | Lehman (CA) | Rowland (CT) |
| Dicks | Lehman (FL) | Rowland (GA) |
| Dingell | Lent | Russo |
| DioGuardi | Levin (MI) | Sabo |
| Dixon | Levine (CA) | Saxton |
| Donnelly | Lewis (CA) | Schaefer |
| Dowdy | Lewis (FL) | Scheuer |
| Downey | Livingston | Schneider |
| Duncan | Lloyd | Schulze |
| Durbin | Long | Schumer |
| Dwyer | Lott | Sharp |
| Dyson | Lowery (CA) | Shaw |
| Eckart (OH) | Lowry (WA) | Shelby |
| Eckert (NY) | Lujan | Shuster |
| Edgar | Luken | Siljander |
| Edwards (OK) | Lundine | Sisisky |
| Emerson | Lungren | Skeen |

| | | |
|---------------|-------------|------------|
| Skelton | Sweeney | Wheat |
| Slattery | Swift | Whitehurst |
| Slaughter | Swindall | Whitley |
| Smith (FL) | Tallon | Whittaker |
| Smith (NH) | Tauzin | Whitten |
| Smith (NJ) | Taylor | Williams |
| Smith, Robert | Thomas (GA) | Wilson |
| Snowe | Traxler | Wirth |
| Snyder | Udall | Wolf |
| Solarz | Valentine | Wolpe |
| Spence | Vander Jagt | Wortley |
| Spratt | Vento | Wright |
| St Germain | Visclosky | Wyden |
| Stallings | Volkmer | Wyllie |
| Stokes | Vucanovich | Yatron |
| Strang | Walgren | Young (AK) |
| Stratton | Walker | Young (FL) |
| Sundquist | Waxman | Young (MO) |

NAYS—119

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Addabbo | Gilman | Porter |
| Anderson | Gonzalez | Regula |
| Applegate | Green | Roberts |
| Archer | Gregg | Rodino |
| Armey | Gunderson | Roth |
| Barton | Hartnett | Roukema |
| Bates | Hayes | Roybal |
| Bedell | Hertel | Rudd |
| Bereuter | Hopkins | Savage |
| Bosco | Jacobs | Schroeder |
| Brown (CA) | Kanjorski | Schuetz |
| Brown (CO) | Kastenmeier | Seiberling |
| Carper | Kildee | Sensenbrenner |
| Carr | Kramer | Shumway |
| Chappie | LaFalce | Sikorski |
| Clay | Leach (IA) | Smith (IA) |
| Collins | Leath (TX) | Smith (NE) |
| Conyers | Leland | Smith, Denny |
| Craig | Lightfoot | Solomon |
| Crockett | Lipinski | Staggers |
| Dannemeyer | Mack | Stangeland |
| DeLay | Madigan | Stark |
| Dellums | Markey | Stenholm |
| Dickinson | Marlenee | Studds |
| Dorgan (ND) | McCandless | Stump |
| Dornan (CA) | McGrath | Synar |
| Dreier | Miller (OH) | Tauke |
| Dymally | Miller (WA) | Thomas (CA) |
| Early | Mitchell | Torres |
| Edwards (CA) | Morrison (CT) | Torricelli |
| English | Mrazek | Towns |
| Evans (IA) | Murphy | Trafficant |
| Fawell | Myers | Watkins |
| Fields | Nelson | Weaver |
| Florio | Oberstar | Weber |
| Foglietta | Owens | Welsh |
| Frank | Pease | Wise |
| Frenzel | Penny | Yates |
| Garcia | Perkins | Zschau |
| Gaydos | Petri | |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|----------|-----------|----------|
| Crane | Gray (IL) | Loeffler |
| Gradison | Hefner | |

□ 2030

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Gray of Illinois for, with Mr. Crane against.

Messrs. LEACH of Iowa, REGULA, and WEBER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. VOLKMER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 2040

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its amendment to the title of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 32, FIRST CONCURRENT BUDGET RESOLUTION—FISCAL YEAR 1986

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the House amendment to Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation marks, and cross-references.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the measure just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2475, SIMPLIFICATION OF IMPUTED INTEREST RULES

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2475) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to simplify the imputed interest rules of sections 1274 and 483, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 99-250)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2475) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to simplify the imputed interest rules of sections 1274 and 483, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO IMPUTED INTEREST RULES

SECTION 101. SIMPLIFICATION OF GENERAL IMPUTED INTEREST RULES.

(a) Reduction of Imputation Rate From 120 to 100 Percent; Elimination of Separate Testing Rate.—

(1) AMENDMENTS OF SECTION 1274.—

(A) Subparagraph (B) of section 1274(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defin-

ing imputed principal amount) is amended by striking out "120 percent of".

(B) Clause (ii) of section 1274(c)(1)(A) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(ii) in any other case, the imputed principal amount of such debt instrument determined under subsection (b), and "

(C) Paragraph (2) of section 1274(c) of such Code is amended by striking out "the testing amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "the imputed principal amount of such debt instrument determined under subsection (b)".

(D) Subsection (c) of section 1274 of such Code is amended by striking out paragraph (3) and by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(2) AMENDMENTS OF SECTION 483.—

(A) The last sentence of section 483(b) of such Code (defining total unstated interest) is amended by striking out "120 percent of".

(B) Subparagraph (B) of section 483(c)(1) of such Code is amended to read as follows: "(B) under which there is total unstated interest."

(b) INTEREST RATES REDETERMINED EACH MONTH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 1274(d) of such Code (defining applicable Federal rate) is amended by striking out subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) DETERMINATION OF RATES.—During each calendar month, the Secretary shall determine the Federal short-term rate, mid-term rate, and long-term rate which shall apply during the following calendar month.

(C) FEDERAL RATE FOR ANY CALENDAR MONTH.—For purposes of this paragraph—

"(i) FEDERAL SHORT-TERM RATE.—The Federal short-term rate shall be the rate determined by the Secretary based on the average market yield (during any 1-month period selected by the Secretary and ending in calendar month in which the determination is made) on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity of 3 years or less.

"(ii) FEDERAL MID-TERM AND LONG-TERM RATES.—The Federal mid-term and long-term rate shall be determined in accordance with the principles of clause (i).

"(D) LOWER RATE PERMITTED IN CERTAIN CASES.—The Secretary may by regulations permit a rate to be used with respect to any debt instrument which is lower than the applicable Federal rate if the taxpayer establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary that such lower rate is based on the same principles as the applicable Federal rate and is appropriate for the term of such instrument."

(2) RATE APPLICABLE TO ANY SALE OR EXCHANGE.—Paragraph (2) of section 1274(d) of such Code (relating to rate applicable to any sale or exchange) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) LOWEST 3-MONTH RATE APPLICABLE TO ANY SALE OR EXCHANGE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any sale or exchange, the applicable Federal rate shall be the lowest 3-month rate.

"(B) LOWEST 3-MONTH RATE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'lowest 3-month rate' means the lowest of the applicable Federal rates in effect of any month in the 3-calendar-month period ending with the 1st calendar month in which there is a binding contract in writing for such sale or exchange."

(c) Rate Increased to 110 Percent in Case of Sale-Leaseback.—Section 1274 of such Code (relating to determination of issue price in the case of certain debt instruments

issued for property) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) 110 PERCENT RATE WHERE SALE-LEASE-BACK INVOLVED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any debt instrument to which this subsection applies, the discount rate used under subsection (b)(2)(B) or section 483(b) shall be 110 percent of the applicable Federal rate, compounded semiannually.

"(2) LOWER DISCOUNT RATES SHALL NOT APPLY.—Section 1274A shall not apply to any debt instrument to which this subsection applies.

"(3) DEBT INSTRUMENTS TO WHICH THIS SUBSECTION APPLIES.—This subsection shall apply to any debt instrument given in consideration for the sale or exchange of any property if, pursuant to a plan, the transferor or any related person leases a portion of such property after such sale or exchange."

SEC. 102. LOWER DISCOUNT RATE IN CASE OF CERTAIN SALES WHERE STATED PRINCIPAL AMOUNT DOES NOT EXCEED \$2,800,000.

(a) General rule.—Subpart A of part V of subchapter P of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to original issue discount) is amended by inserting after section 1274 the following new section:

"SEC. 1274A. SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WHERE STATED PRINCIPAL AMOUNT DOES NOT EXCEED \$2,800,000.

"(a) LOWER DISCOUNT RATE.—In the case of any qualified debt instrument, the discount rate used for purposes of sections 483 and 1274 shall not exceed 9 percent, compounded semiannually.

"(b) QUALIFIED DEBT INSTRUMENT DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified debt instrument' means any debt instrument given in consideration for the sale or exchange of property (other than new section 38 property within the meaning of section 48(b)) if the stated principal amount of such instrument does not exceed \$2,800,000.

"(c) ELECTION TO USE CASH METHOD WHERE STATED PRINCIPAL AMOUNT DOES NOT EXCEED \$2,000,000.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any cash method debt instrument—

"(a) section 1274 shall not apply, and

"(B) interest on such debt instrument shall be taken into account by both the borrower and the lender under the cash receipts and disbursements method of accounting.

"(2) CASH METHOD DEBT INSTRUMENT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'cash method debt instrument' means any qualified debt instrument if—

"(A) the stated principal amount does not exceed \$2,000,000,

"(B) the lender does not use an accrual method of accounting and is not a dealer with respect to the property sold or exchanged,

"(C) section 1274 would have applied to such instrument but for an election under this subsection, and

"(D) an election under this subsection is jointly made with respect to such debt instrument by the borrower and lender.

"(3) SUCCESSORS BOUND BY ELECTION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), paragraph (1) shall apply to any successor to the borrower or lender with respect to a cash method debt instrument.

"(B) EXCEPTION WHERE LENDER TRANSFERS DEBT INSTRUMENT TO ACCRUAL METHOD TAXPAYER.—If the lender (or any successor) transfers any cash method debt instrument to a taxpayer who uses an accrual method of ac-

counting, this paragraph shall not apply with respect to such instrument for periods after such transfer.

"(4) FAIR MARKET VALUE RULE IN POTENTIALLY ABUSIVE SITUATIONS.—In the case of any cash method debt instrument, section 483 shall be applied as if it included provisions similar to the provisions of section 1274(b)(3).

"(d) OTHER SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) AGGREGATION RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(A) all sales or exchanges which are part of the same transaction (or a series of related transactions) shall be treated as 1 sale or exchange, and

"(B) all debt instruments arising from the same transaction (or a series of related transactions) shall be treated as 1 debt instrument.

"(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any debt instrument arising out of a sale or exchange during any calendar year after 1989, each dollar amount contained in the preceding provisions of this section shall be increased by the inflation adjustment for such calendar year. Any increase under the preceding sentence shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$100 (or, if such increase is a multiple of \$50, such increase shall be increased to the nearest multiple of \$100).

"(B) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the inflation adjustment for any calendar year is the percentage (if any) by which—

"(i) the CPI for the preceding calendar year exceeds

"(ii) the CPI for calendar year 1988.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, the CPI for any calendar year is the average of the Consumer Price Index as of the close of the 12-month period ending on September 30 of such calendar year.

"(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection, including—

"(1) regulations coordinating the provisions of this section with other provisions of this title,

"(2) regulations necessary to prevent the avoidance of tax through the abuse of the provisions of subsection (c), and

"(3) regulations relating to the treatment of transfers of cash method debt instruments."

"(b) EXCEPTION FOR ASSUMPTIONS.—Subsection (c) of section 1274 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) EXCEPTION FOR ASSUMPTIONS.—If any person—

"(A) in connection with the sale or exchange of property, assumes any debt instrument, or

"(B) acquires any property subject to any debt instrument,

in determining whether this section or section 483 applies to such debt instrument, such assumption (or such acquisition) shall not be taken into account unless the terms and conditions of such debt instrument are modified (or the nature of the transaction is changed) in connection with the assumption (or acquisition)."

"(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

"(1) Section 483 of such Code is amended by striking out subsection (e) and by redesignating subsections (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively.

"(2) Paragraph (1) of section 483(e) of such Code (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) is amended by striking out "7 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "6 percent".

"(3) Subsection (g) of section 483 of such Code (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) CROSS REFERENCES.—

"(1) For treatment of assumptions, see section 1274(c)(4).

"(2) For special rules for certain transactions where stated principal amount does not exceed \$2,800,000, see section 1274A.

"(3) For special rules in case of the borrower under certain loans for personal use, see section 1275(b)."

"(4) Paragraph (4) of section 280G(d) of such Code is amended by striking out "in accordance with section 1274(b)(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "by using a discount rate equal to 120 percent of the applicable Federal rate (determined under section 1274(d)), compounded semiannually".

"(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart A of part V of subchapter P of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1274 the following new item:

"Sec. 1274A. Special rules for certain transactions where stated principal amount does not exceed \$2,800,000."

SEC. 103. RECOVERY PERIOD FOR 18-YEAR REAL PROPERTY EXTENDED TO 19 YEARS.

(a) In General.—Clause (i) of section 168(b)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to amount of deduction for 18-year real property) is amended by striking out "18-year recovery period" and inserting in lieu thereof "19-year recovery period".

"(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

"(1) The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by striking out "18-year real property" each place it appears in the text and headings thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "19-year real property":

"(A) Section 168 (relating to accelerated cost recovery system).

"(B) Section 57(a)(12) (relating to preference for accelerated cost recovery deduction).

"(C) Section 312(k)(3)(A) (relating to earnings and profits).

"(D) Subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 1245(a)(5) (relating to gain from dispositions of certain depreciable property).

"(2) The table contained in subparagraph (A) of section 168(b)(3) of such Code (relating to election of different recovery percentage) is amended by striking out "18, 35, or 45" and inserting in lieu thereof "19, 35, or 45 years".

"(3)(A) Subparagraph (B) of section 168(f)(1) of such Code (relating to components of section 1250 class property) is amended by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv) and by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause:

"(iii) BUILDINGS PLACED IN SERVICE BEFORE MAY 9, 1985.—In the case of any building placed in service by the taxpayer before May 9, 1985, for purposes of applying subparagraph (A) to components of such buildings placed in service after May 8, 1985, the deduction allowable under subsection (a) with respect to such components shall be computed in the same manner as the deduction allowable with respect to the first component placed in service after May 8, 1985."

"(B) Clause (ii) of section 168(f)(1)(B) of such Code is amended by striking out "March 15, 1984, the" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 15, 1984, and before May 9, 1985, the".

(C) Clause (iv) of section 168(f)(1)(B) of such Code, as redesignated by subparagraph (A), is amended by striking out "or (ii)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(ii), or (iii)".

(4) Clause (ii) of section 168(f)(12)(B) of such Code (relating to limitations for property financed with tax-exempt bonds) is amended—

(A) by striking out "15-year real property" each place it appears in the heading and the text and inserting in lieu thereof "19-year real property"; and

(B) by striking out "15 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "19 years".

(5) Paragraph (2) of section 48(g) of such Code (relating to special rules for qualified rehabilitated buildings) is amended by striking out "18" in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B)(v) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "19".

(6) The table contained in subparagraph (B) of section 47(a)(5) of such Code (relating to special rules for recovery property) is amended by striking out "For 15-year, 10-year, and 5-year property" and inserting in lieu thereof "For property other than 3-year property".

(7) Clause (i) of section 57(a)(12)(B) of such Code (relating to real property and low-income housing) is amended by striking out "18 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "19 years".

SEC. 104. SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN WORKOUTS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Sections 483 and 1274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall not apply to the issuance or modification of any written indebtedness if—

(1) such issuance or modification is in connection with a workout of a specified MLC loan which (as of May 31, 1985) was substantially in arrears; and

(2) the aggregate principal amount of indebtedness resulting from such workout does not exceed the sum (as of the time of the workout) of the outstanding principal amount of the specified MLC loan and any arrearages on such loan.

(b) SPECIFIED MLC LOAN.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term "specified MLC loan" means any loan which, in a submission dated Jun 17, 1985, on behalf of the New York State Mortgage Loan Enforcement and Administration Corporation had one of the following loan numbers: 001, 005, 007, 012, 025, 038, 041, 042, 043, 049, 053, 064, 068, 090, 141, 180, or 188.

SEC. 105. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) SECTIONS 101 AND 102.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by sections 101 and 102 shall apply to sales and exchanges after June 30, 1985, in taxable years ending after such date. The amendment made by section 2 of Public Law 98-612 shall not apply to sales and exchanges after June 30, 1985, in taxable years ending after such date.

(2) REGULATORY AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH LOWER RATE.—Section 1274(d)(1)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as added by section 101(b), shall apply as if included in the amendments made by section 41 of the Tax Reform Act of 1984.

(b) SECTION 103.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by section 103 shall apply with respect to property placed in service by the taxpayer after May 8, 1985.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The amendments made by section 103 shall not apply to property placed in service by the taxpayer before January 1, 1987, if—

(A) the taxpayer or a qualified person entered into a binding contract to purchase or

construct such property before May 9, 1985, or

(B) construction of such property was commenced by or for the taxpayer or a qualified person before May 9, 1985.

For purposes of this paragraph, the term "qualified person" means any person whose rights in such a contract or such property are transferred to the taxpayer, but only if such property is not placed in service before such rights are transferred to the taxpayer.

(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR COMPONENTS.—For purposes of applying section 168(f)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as amended by section 103) to components placed in service after December 31, 1986, property to which paragraph (2) of this subsection applies shall be treated as placed in service by the taxpayer before May 9, 1985.

(4) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—The amendment made by paragraph (6) of section 103(b) shall apply as if included in the amendments made by section 111 of the Tax Reform Act of 1984.

(5) SPECIAL RULE FOR LEASING OF QUALIFIED REHABILITATED BUILDINGS.—The amendment made by paragraph (5) of section 103(b) to section 48(g)(2)(B)(v) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall not apply to leases entered into before May 22, 1985, but only if the lessee signed the lease before May 17, 1985.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO BELOW-MARKET INTEREST RULES

SEC. 201. CERTAIN LOANS TO QUALIFIED CONTINUING CARE FACILITIES EXEMPT FROM BELOW-MARKET INTEREST RATE RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7872 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to treatment of loans with below-market interest rates) is amended by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h) and by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

"(g) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN LOANS TO QUALIFIED CONTINUING CARE FACILITIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply for any calendar year to any below-market loan made by a lender to a qualified continuing care facility pursuant to a continuing care contract if the lender (or the lender's spouse) attains age 65 before the close of such year.

"(2) \$90,000 LIMIT.—Paragraph (1) shall apply only to the extent that the aggregate outstanding amount of any loan to which such paragraph applies (determined without regard to this paragraph), when added to the aggregate outstanding amount of all other previous loans between the lender (or the lender's spouse) and any qualified continuing care facility to which paragraph (1) applies, does not exceed \$90,000.

"(3) CONTINUING CARE CONTRACT.—For purposes of this section, the term 'continuing care contract' means a written contract between an individual and a qualified continuing care facility under which—

"(A) the individual or individual's spouse may use a qualified continuing care facility for their life or lives,

"(B) the individual or individual's spouse—

"(i) will first—

"(I) reside in a separate, independent living unit with additional facilities outside such unit for the providing of meals and other personal care, and

"(II) not require long-term nursing care, and

"(ii) then will be provided long-term and skilled nursing care as the health of such individual or individual's spouse requires, and

"(C) no additional substantial payment is required if such individual or individual's spouse requires increased personal care services or long-term and skilled nursing care.

"(4) QUALIFIED CONTINUING CARE FACILITY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified continuing care facility' means 1 or more facilities—

"(i) which are designed to provide services under continuing care contracts, and

"(ii) substantially all of the residents of which are covered by continuing care contracts.

"(B) SUBSTANTIALLY ALL FACILITIES MUST BE OWNED OR OPERATED BY BORROWER.—A facility shall not be treated as a qualified continuing care facility unless substantially all facilities which are used to provide services which are required to be provided under a continuing care contract are owned or operated by the borrower.

"(C) NURSING HOMES EXCLUDED.—The term 'qualified continuing care facility' shall not include any facility which is of a type which is traditionally considered a nursing home.

"(5) ADJUSTMENT OF LIMIT FOR INFLATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any loan made during any calendar year after 1986 to which paragraph (1) applies, the dollar amount in paragraph (2) shall be increased by the inflation adjustment for such calendar year. Any increase under the preceding sentence shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$100 (or, if such increase is a multiple of \$50, such increase shall be increased to the nearest multiple of \$100).

"(B) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the inflation adjustment for any calendar year is the percentage (if any) by which—

"(i) the CPI for the preceding calendar year exceeds

"(ii) the CPI for calendar year 1985.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, the CPI for any calendar year is the average of the Consumer Price Index as of the close of the 12-month period ending on September 30 of such calendar year."

(b) CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF BELOW-MARKET INTEREST RATE RULES TO LOANS TO QUALIFIED CONTINUING CARE FACILITIES.—Paragraph (1) of section 7872(c) of such Code (relating to below-market loans to which section applies) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(F) LOANS TO QUALIFIED CONTINUING CARE FACILITIES.—Any loan to any qualified continuing care facility pursuant to a continuing care contract."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 7872(c) of such Code is amended by inserting "and subsection (g)" after "subsection".

(2) Subparagraph (E) of section 7872(c)(1) of such Code is amended by striking out "or (C)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(C), or (F)".

SEC. 202. TIME FOR DETERMINING RATE APPLICABLE TO EMPLOYEE RELOCATION LOANS.

Subsection (f) of section 7872 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to treatment of loans with below-market interest rates) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(11) TIME FOR DETERMINING RATE APPLICABLE TO EMPLOYEE RELOCATION LOANS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any term loan made by an employer to an employee the proceeds of which are used by the employee to purchase a principal residence (within the meaning of section 1034), the de-

termination of the applicable Federal rate shall be made as of the date the written contract to purchase such residence was entered into.

"(B) PARAGRAPH ONLY TO APPLY TO CASES TO WHICH SECTION 217 APPLIES.—Subparagraph (A) shall only apply to the purchase of a principal residence in connection with the commencement of work by an employee or a change in the principal place of work of an employee to which section 217 applies."

SEC. 203. SECTION 7872 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE SHALL NOT APPLY TO NON-LOAN PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL HOUSING FACILITIES FOR THE ELDERLY.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of section 7872 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, payments made to a specified independent living facility for the elderly by a payor who is an individual at least 65 years old shall not be treated as loans provided—

(1) the independent living facility is designed and operated to meet some substantial combination of the health, physical, emotional, recreational, social, religious and similar needs of persons over the age of 65;

(2) in exchange for the payment, the payor obtains the right to occupy (or equivalent contractual right) independent living quarters located in the independent living facility;

(3) the amount of the payment is equal to the fair market value of the right to occupy the independent living quarters;

(4) upon leaving the independent living facility, the payor is entitled to receive a payment equal to at least 50 percent of the fair market value at that time of the right to occupy the independent living quarters, the timing of which payment may be contingent on the time when the independent living facility is able to locate a new occupant for such quarters; and

(5) the excess, if any, of the fair market value of the independent living quarters at the time the payor leaves such quarters (less a reasonable amount to cover costs) over the amount paid to the payor is used by an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of such Code to provide housing and related services for needy elderly persons.

(b) SPECIFIED INDEPENDENT LIVING FACILITY FOR THE ELDERLY.—For purposes of this section—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term "specified independent living facility for the elderly" means—

(A) the Our Lady of Life Apartments owned by a Missouri not-for-profit corporation with the same name,

(B) the Laclede Oaks Manor owned by the Lutheran Health Care Association of St. Louis, Missouri, and

(C) the Luther Center Northeast owned by the Lutheran Altenheim Society of Missouri.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—A facility shall not be considered to be a specified independent living facility for the elderly—

(A) if it is located at any site other than the site which it occupied (or was in the process of occupying through construction) on the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(B) if its ownership is transferred after such date of enactment to a person other than an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

SEC. 204. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) SECTION 201.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by section 201 shall apply with respect to loans made after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) SECTION 7872 NOT TO APPLY TO CERTAIN LOANS.—Section 7872 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall not apply to loans made on or before the date of the enactment of this Act to any qualified continuing care facility pursuant to a continuing care contract. For purposes of this paragraph, the terms "qualified continuing care facility" and "continuing care contract" have the meanings given such terms by section 7872(g) of such Code (as added by section 201).

(b) SECTION 202.—The amendment made by section 202 shall apply to contracts entered into after June 30, 1985, in taxable years ending after such date.

(c) SECTION 203.—The provisions of section 203 shall apply as if included in section 172(a) of the Tax Reform Act of 1984.

And the Senate agree to the same.

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
J.J. PICKLE,
CHARLES B. RANGEL,
PETE STARK,
JOHN J. DUNCAN,
BILL ARCHER,
GUY VANDER JAGT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

BOB PACKWOOD,
W.V. ROTH,
JOHN HEINZ,
DAVID DURENBERGER,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
LLOYD BENTSEN,
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA,
DANIEL PATRICK
MOYNIHAN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE
COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2475) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to simplify the imputed interest rules of sections 1274 and 483, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for the House bill and Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

I. SIMPLIFICATION OF GENERAL IMPUTED INTEREST RULES

A. THE IMPUTED INTEREST RULES

Present laws

The imputed interest rate

Overview

Under the imputed interest rules, whether there is adequate stated interest in a debt instrument issued for nonpublicly-traded property is determined by reference to an appropriate "test rate." Where adequate interest is not stated, the imputed interest rules recharacterize a portion of the principal amount of the debt instrument for

income tax purposes using a somewhat higher "imputation rate." The amounts of principal and interest as recharacterized will generally determine the seller's "amount realized" the buyer's basis in the property, and the amount of interest deductions and interest income for the buyer and the seller, respectively. The test rate for a debt instrument subject to the imputed interest rules is the rate in effect on the first day there is a binding contract for the sale or exchange of the property. All test and imputation rates are applied using semiannual compounding.

"Test rates" and "imputation rates"

General rule.—For sales or exchanges after December 31, 1984, of new property eligible for the investment credit, and for all sales or exchanges after June 30, 1985, the test rate is 110 percent of the "applicable Federal rate," and the imputation rate is 120 percent of the "applicable Federal rate."

Special rule for certain transactions before July 1, 1985.—For sales or exchanges after December 31, 1984, and before July 1, 1985, of property other than new property eligible for the investment credit, the test rate for "borrowed amounts" not exceeding \$2 million is 9 percent. The test rate for borrowed amounts exceeding \$2 million is a "blend" of 9 percent on the first \$2 million and 110 percent of the applicable Federal rate (the "AFR") on the excess. In applying the \$2 million limitation, all sales or exchanges that are part of the same transaction (or a series of related transactions) are treated as one transaction, as all debt instruments arising from the same transaction (or a series of related transactions) are treated as one debt instrument. The imputation rate for transactions during this same period is 10 percent for borrowed amounts up to \$2 million and a blend of 10 percent and 120 percent of the AFR for borrowed amounts exceeding \$2 million.

Other lower test and imputation rates.—The test rate for certain sales of homes and farm property after June 30, 1985, may not exceed 9 percent. This exception generally is limited to \$250,000 for sales of homes and \$1 million for sales of farms.

Applicable Federal rate.—The applicable Federal rate ("AFR") for a debt instrument is the lower of two published rates, one specified by the Tax Reform Act of 1984 (the "1984 Act") and one specified in temporary Treasury regulations. The statutory rate is based on the weighted average of yields over a period of six months for marketable obligations of the United States Government with a comparable maturity. Such rates are redetermined at six-month intervals for three categories of debt instruments: short-term maturity (three years or less), mid-term maturity (more than three years but not in excess of nine years), and long-term maturity (more than nine years).¹

The rates determined under the temporary Treasury regulations are intended to reflect more accurately the current marketplace.² These rates are computed monthly

¹ Appropriate adjustments to the rates are to be made for application to debt instruments, the interest on which is wholly or partly exempt from tax (sec. 1288).

² The mechanism provided by the temporary regulations is intended to respond to a problem that may exist where interest rates decline after the period in which the Federal rates were determined.

using the same methodology described above, except that the rates reflect the average yields for one-month periods. In any month, the lower of the six-month rate or the monthly rate is the AFR. However, in cases where the monthly rate is lower than the two preceding months is lower than the AFR for a particular month, the test rate for that month is the lower of the two such rates.

Exceptions.—The imputed interest rules do not apply to the obligor on a debt instrument incurred in the acquisition of personal use property, to the sale of certain patents, to certain annuities, and to transactions involving a sale of property with a sales price of not more than \$3,000.

Method of accounting

Interest income and expense on debt instruments that are issued for property and that do not require the current payment of interest generally must be accounted for on the accrual method of accounting unless one of the following exceptions apply.

The accrual accounting requirement does not apply to (1) debt instruments issued for nonpublicly-traded property in transactions that are excepted from the imputed interest rules, (2) debt created in the sale of certain small businesses and farms, (3) debt created in the sale of a principal residence, and (4) debt created where the total payments are less than \$250,000.

Assumptions

The assumption of the following debt obligations in connection with the sale or exchange of property, or the taking of property subject to such debt obligations, does not result in the application of the imputed interest rules, provided that the terms and conditions of the obligation are not modified in connection with the sale: (1) loans that were made before October 16, 1984, and assumed after December 31, 1984, in connection with the sale of property the purchase price of which does not exceed \$100 million and (2) all loans assumed in connection with the sale of a residence, certain farms, and certain trades or businesses.

House Bill

The imputed interest rules

Overview

The House bill makes four basic changes to the imputed interest rates. First, the House bill generally reduces the test rate from 110 percent of the AFR to 100 percent of the AFR. Second, the House bill provides for lower imputed interest rates for certain smaller transactions. Third, the House bill provides that the imputation rate would be the same as the test rate (i.e., there would be no higher "penalty rate" where inadequate interest is stated). Finally, the House bill revises the computation of the AFR from a semiannual rate to a monthly rate.

Lower overall imputed interest rate

Under the House bill, the imputed interest rate (i.e., the test rate and the imputation rate) is reduced to 100 percent of the AFR.

Lower imputed interest rates for certain smaller transactions

The House bill places a limit on the imputed interest rates in smaller transactions that do not involve new property eligible for the investment tax credit. Under these rules, where the amount of seller financing³

does not exceed \$2 million, the House bill provides that the imputed interest rate cannot exceed 9 percent.⁴ Where the amount of seller financing exceeds \$2 million but is less than \$4 million, the imputed interest rate cannot exceed a "blend" of 9 percent on a specified portion of the seller financing and the 100 percent of the AFR on the remainder. The portion of the seller-financing eligible for the 9 percent rate is equal to \$2 million reduced dollar-for-dollar by the amount of seller financing over \$2 million. Where the amount of seller financing is \$4 million or more, the imputed interest rate is equal to 100 percent of the AFR. The \$2 million and \$4 million thresholds amounts will be indexed for inflation beginning after 1988.

For sales of new property eligible for the investment credit, the imputed interest rate for a seller-financed debt instrument is equal to 100 percent of the AFR regardless of the amount of seller financing.

Elimination of the penalty rate

Under the House bill, the imputation rate for a debt instrument that fails to state adequate interest will be the same as the test rate for that instrument. Accordingly, there is only one "imputed interest rate" for a transaction and there is no separate "penalty rate" where a debt instrument does not state adequate interest for any reason.

Determination of the applicable Federal rate

Under the House bill, the sole mechanism for determining the AFR will be the one currently prescribed by the temporary Treasury regulations. The alternative mechanism under present law for determining the six-month rate prescribed by the 1984 Act will be eliminated.

Under these revised rules, the AFR will be computed using the same methodology as under present law, except that the rates will be determined on a monthly basis and the rate will reflect the average yields for one-month periods. In addition, the AFR for a particular month may be used as the imputed interest rate for contracts for sales or exchanges entered into in that month and the next two succeeding months.

Regulatory authority

The House bill authorizes the Treasury Department to issue regulations specifying the circumstances in which transactions will be treated as "part of the same transaction or related transactions" for the purpose of applying the \$2 million and \$4 million limitations. The House bill also provides that the Treasury Department is authorized to issue regulations under which taxpayers would be permitted to demonstrate that, in appropriate circumstances, a rate lower than AFR provided by the statute, but calculated according to the same principles as the AFR,⁵ is a more appropriate imputed interest rate for a particular debt instrument. Finally, the House bill authorizes the Treasury Department to issue regulations regarding the relationship of the imputed interest provisions to other Code provisions.

Method of accounting

The House bill provides that, in the case of certain debt instruments that otherwise would be subject to the accrual accounting requirement, interest income and expense arising from such debt instruments may be

accounted for on the cash receipts and disbursements method of accounting. To be eligible for such treatment, (1) the stated principal amount of the debt instrument cannot exceed \$2 million, (2) the debt instrument must arise from the sale of property by a cash-basis taxpayer who is not a dealer in the type of property sold, and (3) the lender and the borrower must jointly elect such treatment. A debt instrument meeting these requirements is to be known as a "cash-method debt instrument."

Special rules are provided relating to the treatment of taxpayers who are the successors to either the issuer or holder of a cash-method debt instrument. The Treasury Department is authorized to issue regulations prescribing rules to prevent abuses of the special treatment afforded to cash-method debt instruments.

Assumptions

Under the House bill, if an existing debt instrument is assumed in connection with the sale or exchange of property (or if the property is acquired subject to an existing debt instrument), the imputed interest rules will not apply to such existing debt instrument by reason of such assumption (or acquisition) unless either the terms of the existing debt instrument are modified in connection with the transaction or the nature of the transaction is changed.

Effective date

The provisions of the House bill relating to the amendment of the imputed interest rules are effective for sales or exchanges occurring after June 30, 1985.

Senate amendment

The imputed interest rules

The Senate amendment generally follows the House bill with certain modifications. Under the Senate amendment, in general, the amount of seller financing that would be eligible for the 9 percent rate is \$2 million for all transactions where the amount of seller financing does not exceed \$4 million. In transactions involving the sale of farm property or real property used in certain closely held trades or businesses, \$2 million of seller financing would be eligible for the 9 percent rate, provided the total amount of seller financing did not exceed \$9 million. Also under the Senate amendment, an imputed interest rate of 110 percent of the AFR would apply to any sale-leaseback transaction or any transaction involving a sales price in excess of \$25 million. In addition, where the AFR exceeded 12 percent, the imputed interest rate for certain transactions would be limited to the sum of 12 percent and one-third of the excess of the AFR over 12 percent.

The authority granted to the Treasury Department to provide regulations that would permit taxpayers to prove that a lower imputed interest rate is appropriate would be effective as if it were contained in the 1984 Act.

Method of accounting

The Senate amendment is the same as the House bill.

Assumptions

The Senate amendment is the same as the House bill.

Conference agreement

The imputed interest rules

The conference agreement generally follows the House bill with the following modifications. Under the conference agreement, where the amount of seller financing does

³ The amount of seller financing is measured by the stated principal amount of the seller-financed debt instrument.

⁴ As under present law, all rates will be compounded semiannually.

⁵ That is, rate that is calculated by reference to Treasury obligations with similar maturity.

not exceed \$2,800,000, the imputed interest rate generally may not exceed 9 percent. Where the amount of seller financing is greater than \$2,800,000, the imputed interest rate is generally 100 percent of the AFR. An imputed interest rate of 110 percent of the AFR, however, applies to sale-leaseback transactions. Indexing of the \$2,800,000 threshold for the 9 percent rate (and the \$2 million threshold for cash-method debt instruments) begins after 1989.

The effective date of the regulatory authority relating to the use of a lower imputed interest rate is the same as in the Senate amendment. In this regard, the conferees intend that the regulatory authority be exercised in a manner so that the lower rate would be permitted only in circumstances where it can be demonstrated that both the rate recalculated based on the same principles as the AFR and the rate at which the borrower can borrow funds on an arm's length basis is lower than the AFR that otherwise would be applicable to the borrower's debt instrument. Further, it is intended that the rate permitted under the regulations would be not less than the borrower's arm's length borrowing rate.

The conferees understand that where a sale or exchange takes place after June 30, 1985, pursuant to a binding contract entered into on or before that date, the imputed interest rates for such a transaction are to be determined pursuant to the provisions of the conference agreement using the applicable Federal rates in effect on the date the binding contract was entered into. For example, if a seller executes a binding contract on March 15, 1985, with a buyer to purchase nonpublicly-traded property with seller financing of \$3 million and the transaction is closed on July 15, 1985, the test rate is 100 percent of the AFR for March 15, 1985.

Under the conference agreement, the imputed interest rules will not be applied to the issuance or modification of certain specified debt instruments held by the New York State Mortgage Loan Enforcement and Administration Corporation provided such issuance or modification is in connection with the workout of such debt instruments and the principal amount of indebtedness resulting from such workout does not exceed the sum (as of the time of the workout) of the outstanding principal amount of the specified debt instrument and any arrearages thereon. The conferees understand that the rate of interest charged with respect to the arrearages shall be not less than the rate on the related loan. The conferees intend no inference in adopting this provision regarding the appropriate income tax treatment of such debt instruments or of other debt instruments in similar circumstances. Specifically, the conferees intend that no inferences be taken from the adoption of this provision that any arrangements existing prior to or resulting from these workout agreements is properly considered as debt for tax purposes.

Method of accounting

The conference agreement is the same as the House bill and the Senate amendment.

Assumptions

The conference agreement is the same as the House bill and the Senate amendment. The conferees are concerned about the extent to which the assumption rules apply when the terms of the debt are modified. The conferees expect that the Treasury Department will issue regulations, consistent with the purposes of these provisions, regarding the proper tax treatment of all par-

ties in transactions where the terms and conditions of the obligation are modified or changed in connection with the transfer of property.

B. ACCELERATED COST RECOVERY SYSTEM

Present law

In general, domestic real property placed in service after March 15, 1984, and qualifying as recovery property, may be depreciated on an accelerated basis under ACRS over an 18-year period, under tables of recovery percentages prescribed by the Treasury Department. These tables reflect a "mid-month" convention for property placed in service after June 22, 1984. Taxpayers may also elect to depreciate such property on a straight-line basis over 18, 35, or 45 years. The recovery period under ACRS for low-income housing described in sections 1250(a)(1)(B) (i), (ii), (iii) or (iv) is 15 years and no mid-month convention is used.

Under transitional rules provided by the 1984 Act, property placed in service after March 15, 1984, pursuant to binding contracts entered into, or where construction was commenced by or for the taxpayer, prior to March 16, 1984, may be eligible for a 15-year recovery period. Special rules under the 1984 Act are also provided relating to components of real property placed in service prior to March 16, 1984, that are placed in service on or after that date.⁶

House bill

Under the House bill, the minimum recovery period for domestic real property qualifying as recovery property generally is increased from 18 years to 19 years. However, this change in the recovery period does not affect the ACRS provisions relating to low-income housing (the recovery period of which remains at 15 years).

The provision of the House bill relating to the ACRS recovery period for real property is generally effective for property placed in service after May 8, 1985. Transitional rules similar to those under the 1984 Act are provided for property that is placed in service after May 8, 1985, and before January 1, 1987, where there was a binding contract to construct or acquire the property, or where construction was begun by or for the taxpayer before May 9, 1985. Special rules apply to components placed in service after May 8, 1985.⁷

Senate amendment

The Senate amendment is the same as the House bill with the exception that a conforming amendment relating to the eligibility of lessee-incurred costs for the rehabilitation tax credit (secs. 46 and 48(g)) is not effective for leases executed prior to May 22, 1985, if the lessee signed the lease before May 17, 1985.

Conference agreement

The conference agreement is the same as the Senate amendment. The conferees intend that the recovery percentages to be computed by the Treasury Department be done on a more exact basis than is current practice. Specifically, if the Treasury Department provides that depreciation may be calculated by applying specified percentages to the basis of the property, the conferees intend that the percentage be expressed to at least the nearest tenth of a percentage point. Similarly, separate percentage rates should be provided for each month during a taxable year during which the property may be placed in service.

⁶ Sec. 168(f)(1).

⁷ Sec. 168(f)(1).

II. BELOW-MARKET LOAN PROVISIONS

Persent law

Section 7872 of the Code, added by the 1984 Act, generally provides that certain loans that bear interest at a below-market rate, are to be treated as loans bearing interest at the market rate accompanied by a payment or payments from the lender to the borrower which are characterized in accordance with the substance of the particular transaction (e.g., gift, compensation, dividend, etc.). The market rate of interest for purposes of section 7872 is assumed to be 100 percent of the AFR at the time the loan is made in the case of a term loan or, in the case of a demand loan, 100 percent of the AFR in effect over the time that the loan is outstanding. The monthly rate provided by the temporary Treasury regulations under the imputed interest rules does not apply for this purpose.

Section 7872 applies to (1) loans where the foregone (i.e., below-market) interest is in the nature of a gift, (2) loans to an employee from an employer or to an independent contractor from one for whom the independent contractor provides services, (3) loans between a corporation and a shareholder of the corporation, (4) loans of which one of the principal purposes of the interest arrangement is the avoidance of any Federal tax, and (5) to the extent provided in Treasury regulations, any below-market loan if the interest arrangement of such loan has a significant effect on any Federal tax liability of either the lender or borrower. The provisions of section 7872 generally apply to term loans made after June 6, 1984, and to demand loans made after that date (or demand loans outstanding after June 6, 1984, which are not repaid before September 17, 1984). However, the below-market loan rules do not apply to loans made to elderly care facilities before June 6, 1984, that are contingent on the continued residence of the lender at the facility. The application of section 7872 is limited by certain *de minimis* exceptions and, for certain gift loans, by the net investment income of the borrower. In addition, transactions covered by the last category above (i.e., number 5) would not be effective prior to the issuance of such Treasury regulations.

Below-market loans made by individuals pursuant to arrangements providing for the satisfaction of personal needs in retirement may be considered to come within either of the last two categories.

House bill

No provision.

Senate amendment

Loans to continuing care facilities

Overview

Under the Senate amendment, certain below-market loans to a "continuing care facility," made pursuant to a "continuing care contract" are excepted from the below-market loan provisions of the Code. Thus, under the Senate amendment, such loans will not be treated as bearing an interest rate equal to the applicable Federal rate and no additional payments will be treated as made from the lender to the borrower. Loans to continuing care facilities pursuant to continuing care contracts would be subject to the below-market loan provisions to the extent that the criteria for the exception are not met.

Continuing care contract

A continuing care contract is an arrangement between an individual or a married

couple and a continuing care facility that meets five requirements. Under the first requirement, a retired individual or couple must be entitled to the use of the continuing care facility for the remainder of the individual's life or both married spouses' lives. Under the second requirement, such use must commence with residence in a separate, independent living unit provided by the continuing care facility.

Under the third requirement, during the period in which the individuals reside in the independent living units, the continuing care facility must be obliged to provide such individuals with various "personal care" services. Under the fourth requirement, the continuing care facility must also undertake to provide long-term nursing care for those individuals who are no longer capable of living independently, even with the aid of personal care services. Under the fifth requirement, the continuing care contract must require the continuing care facility to provide the personal care and long-term nursing services without substantial additional cost to the individual (i.e., there must be a significant insurance-like element for the individual).

Continuing care facility

A continuing care facility is one or more facilities that are designed to provide services under continuing care contracts and substantially all of the residents of which have entered into continuing care contracts.

Limitations

The exception is available for a loan only as of the calendar year in which the lender has attained age 65. A loan from either or both members of a married couple where only one spouse has attained age 65 will be treated as qualifying for the exception if both of the spouses are to reside in the continuing care facility. The exception applies only to the extent that the principal amount of a loan, when added to the aggregate outstanding amount of all other previous loans between the lender (or if the lender is married, the lender and the lender's spouse) to any continuing care facility, does not exceed \$90,000. This amount is indexed for inflation.

Special rule for certain payments

Payment arrangements meeting specified requirements, between an individual and an elderly care facility meeting specified requirements are not treated as loans for purposes of the below-market loan rules. In general, the payment arrangement is one where an initial payment and a portion thereof that is refundable is based on the fair market value of residential accommodations supplied to the individual by the elderly care facility.

Effective date

The provisions of the Senate amendment relating to below-market loans to continuing care facilities pursuant to continuing care contracts are generally effective with respect to such loans that are made after the date of enactment. All such loans made on or before the date of enactment are expected from the below-market loan rules. In addition, any Treasury regulations relating to the application of the below-market loan rules to loans made to any elderly care facilities are prohibited from taking effect prior to January 1, 1986.

Employee relocation loans

The Senate amendment modifies the below-market loan rules with respect to so-called "employee relocation loans." An employee relocation loan is a loan from an em-

ployer to an employee, the proceeds of which are used by the employee toward the purchase of a principal residence in connection with commencement of work by the employee at a new principal place of work. The purchase of the principal residence must occur in a situation where any moving expenses incurred by the employee would be deductible under section 217 of the Code.

In the case of such employee relocation loans, the rate used for determining whether the loan is a below-market loan to which additional interest will be imputed, in the AFR for the month in which the employee enters into a written contract for the purchase of the principal residence, rather than the month in which the loan is made.

The provisions of the Senate amendment relating to employee relocation loans are effective for loans made pursuant to purchase contracts entered into after June 30, 1985.

Conference agreement

Loans to continuing care facilities

The conference agreement generally follows the Senate amendment with certain modifications. First, the requirement that the continuing care facility own or operate substantially all the facilities used to provide services under a continuing care contract is effective without regard to when a facility began operating (or a contract for the construction of the facility was entered into). Second, no restrictions are placed on the effective date of any Treasury regulations relating to the application of the below-market loan rules to loans made to elderly care facilities.

The provision in the Senate amendment relating to whether specified payment arrangements are to be treated as loans for purposes of the below-market loan rules is limited to three specified elderly care facilities that would not qualify as continuing care facilities under the Senate amendment. In this regard, the conferees confirm that the below-market loan rules of the 1984 Act and the changes made to those rules by this bill only apply to transactions that are loans for Federal income tax purposes. The conferees specifically intend that the provisions of the bill do not define, and do not alter, the prior law rules relating to what transactions are, or are not, to be treated as loans. In addition, the conferees understand that a payment to a continuing care facility pursuant to a continuing care contract frequently is wholly or partially refundable for a relatively brief period (e.g., six months) essentially for consumer protection purposes pursuant to State law or regulations. The conferees also understand that payments to a continuing care facility are often refundable on a declining pro rata basis over a somewhat longer period (often up to eight years). The conferees understand that such payments ordinarily would be treated as the advance payment of fees and not as loans under present law.

In addition, certain technical modifications have been made to the language contained in the Senate amendment.

Employee relocation loans

The conference agreement follows the Senate amendment.

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
J.J. PICKLE,
CHARLES B. RANGEL,
PETE STARK,
JOHN J. DUNCAN,
BILL ARCHER,
GUY VANDER JAGT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

BOB PACKWOOD,
W.V. ROTH,
JOHN HEINZ,
DAVID DURENBERGER,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
LLOYD BENTSEN,
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA,
DANIEL PATRICK
MOYNIHAN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2475), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to simplify the imputed interest rules of sections 1274 and 483, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of managers be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] has called up the conference report, and pursuant to the order of the House of today, the conference report is considered as having been read.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2475 provides a permanent solution to the controversy surrounding the imputed interest rules enacted in the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984. Last fall, Congress passed temporary legislation modifying the original imputed interest rules. This stopgap legislation expired on July 1, 1985. On May 21, 1985, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 2475 by a unanimous vote of 425 to 0. The bill was passed by the Senate with amendments on June 26, 1985. Under my unanimous-consent request, the differences between the two bills would be reconciled, and the imputed interest problem will be resolved at long last.

Under the compromise, transactions with seller financing of \$2.8 million or less would require an imputed interest rate of the lesser of 9 percent, or 100 percent of the Federal rate. The 9 percent rate is not available for new property eligible for the investment tax credit. For seller financing in excess of \$2.8 million, the imputed interest rate is 100 percent of the Federal rate. Both parties in transactions under \$2 million may elect to use the cash method of accounting. The \$2 million and \$2.8 million thresholds will be indexed for inflation beginning after 1989. This structure closely resembles the structure passed by the House. A Senate amendment is included to provide that seller financing for sale-leaseback transactions must use an imputed interest rate equal to 110 percent of the Federal rate.

My unanimous-consent request provides that certain "workout agreements" of "specified MLC loans" will be exempted from the imputed interest rules. However, the bill does not contain any inference regarding whether any indebtedness existing prior to or resulting from these workout agreements are properly considered debt for tax purposes. My request also includes a technical Senate amendment relating to the treatment of employee relocation loans for the purchase of a principal residence in connection with a job-related move. In the case of such a loan, the rate in effect on the date that the purchase contract becomes binding.

Finally, my request includes a Senate amendment dealing with life care facilities. Specifically, loans of \$90,000 or less made by a taxpayer age 65 or older to a "continuing care facility" pursuant to a "continuing care contract" would be exempt from the below-market loan rules enacted in the 1984 act. A continuing care facility is one which is owned or operated by one entity providing services under a continuing care contract where substantially all of the residents entered the facility pursuant to a continuing care contract. Furthermore, as stated in the Senate Finance Committee report, payments to a continuing care facility are often refundable for a relatively brief period—that is, 6 months—or on a declining, pro rata basis over a somewhat longer period, often up to 8 years. It is intended that these payments will be treated as advance payments of fees, and not as loans. This provision would also exempt certain elderly care centers run by certain charitable and religious organizations in the St. Louis, MO, area.

Consistent with both the House and Senate bill, my request includes a 1-year increase from 18 to 19 years, in the depreciation recovery period for real estate—other than low-income housing—in order to ensure that the bill is revenue neutral. My request in-

cludes a minor change in the effective date of this provision to accommodate certain leasing transactions caught in the pipeline by the effective date in the original House bill. To avoid any unintended revenue loss, the Treasury Department is directed to precisely determine the new depreciation rates.

Except for the provisions lengthening the depreciation period for real property, the bill will apply to sales or exchanges after June 30, 1985. However, the Treasury regulatory authority to establish lower rates in certain circumstances will apply as if included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

Mr. Speaker, we are presenting to the House a bipartisan compromise that addresses legitimate concerns raised by last year's imputed interest rules. I urge the House to again give unanimous approval to H.R. 2475 as it did last May.

□ 2050

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in requesting the House to approve the conference report on H.R. 2475.

The issues raised by H.R. 2475 are not new to this body. The original House version of the bill represented an excellent compromise of the various concerns affecting seller financing transactions. The other body made only minor amendments to the substantive thrust of the original House bill but did add certain unrelated amendments. The conference report accepts some of those amendments while rejecting others. On balance, in view of the importance of achieving enactment of permanent seller financing rules, I urge the House to expeditiously approve this agreement.

Some urgency is appropriate because the stop-gap provisions enacted last fall expired on June 30, 1985. Were it not for this deadline, I might prefer to spend more time examining some of the other body's amendments to determine whether further modification of them would be helpful. We can, of course, do this through an oversight process in the future. In any event, I think it is important that we resolve this matter as expeditiously as possible, because many taxpayers are potentially affected adversely by the expiration of the stop-gap rules. Further delay in resolving this matter will only serve to create uncertainty which is both disruptive and unfair to taxpayers. I urge the House to approve the conference report.

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the work of the conferees, particularly, and point out to my colleagues that this is going to be not only helpful to the realty industry, which has had some degree of uncertainty, but to the farm agricultural sales, which have had a real tough time deciding what the rules are going to be, and it is going to be very helpful to us in agriculture. I want to thank the committee.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ARCHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I took a very, very strong role in opposing the imputed interest rules from its inception in the conference committee when it was adopted. I have played, hopefully, an active role in designing this effort to lift the onerous restrictions place by those imputed interest rules.

I have signed this conference report. It is not everything that I would have liked. But it certainly does go a long, long way in eliminating the very, very dire consequences of the imputed interest rules on most transactions. I am not satisfied with the life care provisions that the Senate put in, but that was a quid pro quo to get this conference report passed and to lift the restrictions that would otherwise apply.

So I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL], a member of the committee.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, this conference report should be adopted. I have serious objections to two extraneous amendments, both of which were described by the chairman. I have reservations about the procedures. However, the need to restore certainty in the marketplace exceeds the reservations which I have.

Also, our need to get out of here is important, as well. We have all been recorded on this matter before. I think it is unnecessary to have another recorded vote. I hope the bill will be promptly adopted.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH], a member of the committee.

Mr. McGRATH. I thank the ranking minority member for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I congratulate the chairman and the ranking minority member for their efforts during this conference.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I support what he is trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, a number of Members have asked if we are going to bring up H.R. 3008. The minority leader of the subcommittee and I, out of deference and respect to the Members, have decided to win the bill in September.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, the Federal debt, now more than \$1.3 trillion, has quadrupled during the past 8 years. In the past 22 years, while our population has grown 27.5 percent, prices have grown 246 percent, and the Federal budget has grown 1,000 percent. While I will support this budget resolution it is unfortunately nothing more than a heavy fog in the face of a budgetary forest fire. Year in and year out, we have spent more than we have taken in, creating a series of increasing deficits which have placed this nation in economic danger. There is no place left to hide, no one left to whom we can pass the buck. Congress must now face some tough decisions.

Not only do deficits indicate improper management of our Federal funds, but they also create serious difficulties for our economy. High interest rates and low economic growth interact to create an uneven field upon which our industry and workers must play. In this vicious cycle, the more the Federal Government spends, which many Democrats would have us believe to be beneficial, the less money there is for our economy. In short, there is no way to have full employment and balanced growth in our present budget environment.

Earlier today, the budget conferees approved a resolution that will, according to the Congressional Budget Office, cut some \$39 billion from Federal deficit in fiscal year 1986—some \$17 billion less than the \$56 plus billion originally discussed. While I will support final passage of this measure, I have some serious reservations concerning its long-term effectiveness in reducing the chronic Federal deficit. Gentlemen, this measure is simply milk toast. Bargaining has given the House its COLA money and the Senate its defense money. This resolution is nothing more than another in a series of big-spender you-get-yours-and-I'll-get-mine deals that have driven our Federal deficit up to the \$200 billion level.

Mr. Speaker, in my estimation, this resolution amounts to a surrender of our budget process to the deficit and partisan posturing. There is no way we can reduce our deficit below \$100 billion by 1988 without making some of the tough decisions facing Congress, such as the cost of across-the-board COLA's and runaway domestic spend-

ing and getting cost-effective defense spending. Although, Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 is our last chance before recess to make a dent in our deficit, I want to remind my colleagues that this legislation is only a beginning. We must acquire the intestinal fortitude to make the tough decisions facing our children's and their children's future.

I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by urging all my colleagues not to let this chance for some deficit progress slip away and support Senate Concurrent Resolution 32. Let us not settle for another budgetless year.

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. Final enactment of this bill will eliminate a great deal of confusion and uncertainty as to the future of seller-financing of real estate.

With this bill common sense will prevail as public policy. The imputed interest rules we approved last year as part of the Tax Reform Act were properly motivated toward eliminating abuses in seller-financed real estate transactions. But, properly motivated or not, they were unfair and caused havoc in the real estate industry.

In closing a tax loophole we tightened a noose around the necks of honest homeowners, farmers, and small businesspeople who wished to engage in routine real estate transactions.

For a number of months, many people have been uncertain as to whether Congress would finally act to rectify last year's injustice. Many people have been hesitant to negotiate the sale of their homes, farms, and businesses, and I am certain our economy has suffered as a result. But today we were restoring some uniformity and certainty to the marketplace.

This compromise represents a good faith effort to restore some sense and sensibility to the Tax Code. Our colleague, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and others who have worked so hard on this legislation deserve credit for responding to the concerns of the Congress and the American people. As a realtor I know the impact of seller financing issue on real estate transactions. The House action is the appropriate action.●

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a personal explanation on certain missed votes and to have the statement appear in the appropriate place in the permanent RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, because of obligations in my congressional district, I was not present for part of the session on July 16, 1985, and I consequently missed three rollcall votes, those numbered 226, 227, and 228. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on all three of those votes.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES TODAY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses at any time today, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman why?

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman will yield, it is anticipated, Mr. Speaker, that following the action of the House in adopting the conference report on the budget that the House would be awaiting Senate action on the budget and the adoption of the adjournment resolution by the other body. Since we have not programmed legislation during this late part of the evening, pending the action of the Senate, it was the intention to declare a recess until the Senate reports its action to the House.

Mr. STRANG. I thank the gentleman for his explanation, and I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS, AND TO APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Wednesday, September 4, 1985, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations, and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1985

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, September 4, 1985, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS CHAIRMAN OF COMMISSION ON U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BICENTENARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of House Resolution 249, 99th Congress, the Chair, without objection, appoints the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. Boggs], as Chairman of the Commission on the U.S. House of Representatives Bicentenary.

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF THE HONORABLE JIM WRIGHT TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS UNTIL SEPTEMBER 4, 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, August 1, 1985.

I hereby designate the Honorable Jim Wright to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions until September 4, 1985.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

□ 2100

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of the special order speech today by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MAVROULES].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

POSTAL SERVICE HARDSHIP DELIVERY POLICY

(Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and the distinguished gentleman from California, the Honorable EDWARD R. ROYBAL, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Treasury and Postal Service Appropriations and the Select Committee on Aging, I introduced yesterday legislation that will require the U.S. Postal Service to prescribe regulations relating to the delivery of mail to physically handicapped individuals.

On December 20, 1984, Mrs. Lois Martin, an elderly resident of Baxley, GA was fatally struck by a passing motorist as she attempted to cross a frequently traveled highway to retrieve her mail. Mrs. Martin was 79 years of age, wore hearing aids in both ears and had impaired vision. It is quite possible, had an alternative method of mail delivery been available to Mrs. Martin, this tragic situation could have been avoided.

Although the Postal Service has a policy that provided door delivery for individual customers for whom regular delivery would place an extreme hardship, it is ambiguous at best, and provides no written criteria for determining eligibility. The current hardship delivery policy consists of a one-sentence paragraph in the Postal Operations Manual and the Domestic Mail Manual. I find it disturbing that written guidelines exist nowhere within the Postal Service to provide guidance for postal officials who are charged with making a decision on who qualifies.

Thus, this legislation will require the Postal Service to develop written criteria and guidelines for the granting of a hardship delivery exception to the regular mail delivery and publish such information in the Federal Register for public comment. The bill is designed to codify the current Postal Service policy and directs them to identify to the best of their ability those individuals for whom the policy was originally designed.

It is extremely unfortunate that such a tragic situation had to occur prior to this matter receiving some attention. However, the offering of this bill today may very well prevent such a situation from reoccurring in my district or some other congressional district with similar circumstances. While the measure does not mandate any particular individual as being eligible for an alternative method of mail delivery, it provides the mechanism for making a determination.

[From the Baxley News-Banner, Jan. 10, 1985]

CHRISTMAS TRAGEDY REMEMBERED

Dear Mr. Gardner, Christmas has just passed, but our families' was not a Christmas to remember. We lost our grandmother Christmas day in a tragedy that was unne-

cessary and one that, we feel, could have been prevented.

On Dec. 20 I left work and drove the eight miles home to find my husband's grandmother, Lois Martin, lying on the highway. She was struck by a car as she was coming back from her mailbox, which is across the highway from her house. I won't go into the gory details of what I saw as she lay unconscious on Highway 15 S. She was rushed to Appling General Hospital and then transferred to Ware Memorial Hospital in Waycross, where she lay semiconscious for five days. She died on Christmas Day.

As my husband, Keith, and I sat in the hospital watching and waiting to see what would happen, we wondered what could be done to prevent a tragedy like this from happening again.

Grannie Martin's mailbox has been on her side of the highway for at least 30 years, that we know of. Two years ago she was told, as we were, that our mailboxes would have to be put across the highway. Keith's family contacted the post office to see what could be done to get Grannie's mailbox moved back to her side of the highway. They were told that the mailbox could not be moved and that if it was moved, she would no longer be served.

Please keep in mind that we are talking about a 79 year old woman who had had cataract surgery on both eyes, and hearing aids in both ears. The post office is asking her to cross a busy highway to get her mail.

On Dec. 27, the day of the funeral, someone asked Mrs. Dyal (Keith's mother) if the post office had informed us of a "hardship case delivery". We had not been told anything about this. We have since found out more about it. A simple letter from her doctor would have taken care of the matter IF we had known about it. The post office had told us nothing could be done, and we took them at their word.

Two days before Mother's Day in 1984 Grannie was almost hit by a car. The car went in the ditch to avoid running into her. Again the post office was contacted to see if we could move the mailbox. We received the same reply . . . no.

We found out since this accident that Grannie, herself went to the post office in December to ask again about getting the mailbox moved from across the highway and again the same reply . . . no.

I realize that there are laws and regulations that have to be observed by the postal service, but NO ONE, especially not a 79 year old lady should have to cross a busy highway to get their mail! What happened to helping senior citizens or just plain old common courtesy?

Since Grannie's death we have found out about many people that have to walk across a highway to get their mail and of the many "close calls" they have had.

Mr. Gardner, there are many people throughout the area where we live that have small children, including myself, and many elderly people that have to walk across the highway to get their mail. We as a family and we the community out on Hwy. 15 S. want to see that something is done to prevent a tragedy like this from happening again. We realize that it is too late to save Lois Martin's life but through our effort and yours we would like to see that something is done about getting the citizens' mailboxes moved to their own side of the highway.

The day after the accident someone moved our mailbox, Grannie Martin's mailbox, and the mailbox of another elderly

couple down the road from us back to our side of the highway in an effort to help save us from the tragedy that Grannie suffered. We have yet to receive any mail in our box, Grannies' box, or the couple down the road's box.

I am issuing a plea to the people of Apple County that are interested in avoiding further tragedies. Please join us in our effort to get mailboxes moved from across highways all over the county. If you will help, please feel free to contact us at any time.

Thank you,

KEITH AND JOAN DYAL.

BAXLEY, GA.

DIALOG ON NICARAGUA

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, many of our Members have addressed the subject of violence this morning in South Africa, Afghanistan, and the Soviet Union, and I would like to talk about violence in Central America.

I have here a summary of a recent dialog between Dr. Wayne Smith, former head of the U.S. interest section in Cuba and Sandinista officials, reporting on the fact that Nicaraguans remain ready to negotiate political concerns of Americans in Central America, which include prohibition of foreign bases, the withdrawal of foreign military personnel, the halting of military buildup, and the halting of cross-border support for guerrillas.

What remains, Mr. Speaker, is a U.S. policy that seeks a political rather than a military solution. Knowing of Members' interest in the recent developments in Central America, I am including a copy of this summary in the RECORD and forwarding the same to Members of Congress so that they will have this report available during the recess.

JULY 30, 1985.

HON. BILL ALEXANDER,
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALEXANDER: I returned last week from a trip to Managua during which I had the opportunity to talk with President Daniel Ortega, to Acting Foreign Minister Tinoco, and to various other Nicaraguan leaders. On the basis of these conversations, I would say it is quite clear that the Nicaraguans remain ready to address our security concerns in the area. As part of a regional settlement, they would be prepared to do the following:

To prohibit foreign bases. The Nicaraguans would agree not to permit any Soviet or Cuban bases on their territory. This would of course be subject to on-site verification. In return, they would expect the other Central American countries also to prohibit foreign bases. This would mean that U.S. advance bases in Honduras would have to be dismantled.

To withdraw foreign military personnel. The Nicaraguans are also prepared to negotiate a formula for the drastic reduction of foreign military personnel in the area. Since

the formula presented to the draft Contadora treaties was unacceptable to El Salvador and Honduras, it would probably be better to concentrate on a numerical limitation. That is perfectly acceptable to the Nicaraguans, provided the limit is balanced and reciprocal.

To halt any military buildup. The Nicaraguans are prepared to sit down with their neighbors at any time to work out a formula for the imposition of ceilings on the size of armies and restrictions on the number and nature of their armaments.

To halt cross-border support for guerrillas. The Sandinistas are prepared to commit themselves not to engage in the provision of material support to the guerrillas in El Salvador or to any other groups in Central America. They would submit to on-site verification procedures. The other side of the coin would be that the United States, Honduras, and Costa Rica would have to halt their support for the contras.

The Sandinistas are prepared to negotiate not only these security-related issues but also a series of commitments related to human rights, political pluralism, and national reconciliation. They are not going to accept the conditions for an internal dialogue put forward by the so-called Declaration of San Jose, but they do not reject a dialogue with some elements of the opposition. Certainly we are likely to encourage more progress in these internal matters through diplomacy than through military action.

It seems quite clear to me that we could achieve most of our objectives, especially those which are security-related (and they are the most important ones to us) through negotiations leading to verifiable international agreements. It is equally clear, however, that the Administration has no real interest in the negotiating option. This was illustrated anew a few days ago. On July 22 the foreign ministers of the Contadora countries called on the United States and Nicaragua to resume their bilateral talks. Nicaragua almost immediately reiterated its willingness to do so. As you know, however, the United States has refused the Contadora request. Given that the Nicaraguans are prepared to negotiate and to co-operate with the Contadora process, while we refuse, it is difficult to understand how the Administration can seriously argue that we must continue funding the Contras so as to pressure the Sandinistas to negotiate. If we wanted to negotiate, the Sandinistas would be ready to sit down with us right now. Further, we cannot say we are cooperating with the Contadora process and at the same time press ahead with our so-called "secret" war against Nicaragua. The two things are mutually exclusive.

Having studied our present policy toward Nicaragua in some detail, I have concluded that it is essentially counter-productive; certainly it does not achieve our objectives. I am further persuaded that the Contadora process cannot succeed under present conditions. If it is to work, the United States itself must become directly involved. I have prepared a paper which outlines these conclusions in greater detail. For your convenience, the summary of that paper is reproduced below. I hope you find it useful:

AN ALTERNATIVE POLICY FOR NICARAGUA

I. Summary

The Reagan administration's policy toward Nicaragua is one of weakness and ineffective bluster. Rather than preventing a second Cuba, it leads inexorably toward one. Rather than making the use of American

troops unnecessary, it will, if followed to its logical conclusion, almost certainly culminate with U.S. military involvement. Rather than "containing" a Marxist regime, the Reagan policy leaves it unfettered and enhances its international standing. Far from being the tough, resolute approach portrayed by the President, present policy is one of confusion and ineffective measures which detract from, rather than enhance, our image as a great, self-confident power that knows how to protect its interests with a minimum of force.

The United States has legitimate concerns in Nicaragua and is right to be suspicious of Sandinista intentions. Present policy, however, does not effectively address those concerns or advance sensible U.S. objectives. The most urgent U.S. aims should be: 1) to prohibit the establishment of any Soviet or Cuban bases; 2) to bring about the withdrawal of foreign military personnel; 3) to halt all cross-border support for guerrillas and other subversive groups; and 4) to place a ceiling on military establishments so that no one country, Nicaragua or any other, be in a position to threaten its neighbors. Beyond these security-related objectives, the United States should also want to promote pluralism, human rights and economic well-being in the area.

None of the objectives outlined above is served by present policy. The Administration speaks in clichés of "supporting democracy" and "stopping communism", but it has not been able to explain in over three years time how funding the contras accomplishes those purposes. In fact, of course, it does not. Funding the contras is more a public relations gimmick than a policy. The contras do not have the capability to overthrow the Sandinistas, nor has their war against the latter advanced any of the U.S. objectives outlined above. Quite the contrary, thanks to present U.S. policy and the activities of the contras, there are more Cuban advisers in Nicaragua now than four years ago, a closer military relationship between Managua, Havana and Moscow, and greater tensions.

In addition to being ineffective, moreover, present U.S. policy toward Nicaragua violates international norms, is inconsistent with our traditional values, divides rather than unites the U.S. body politic and is not supported by our allies. No major government in the world supports our clandestine war against the Sandinistas. No government outside Central America supports our economic embargo against Nicaragua. Rather than upholding rule of law, present policy undermines it.

What the U.S. should be doing is to so bind and restrain the Sandinistas through verifiable, international agreements as to achieve all our security-related objectives and most of the others as well. This could be done. The Sandinistas have recently reiterated that as part of a regional accommodation inspired by the Contadora process, they would commit themselves not to permit any foreign bases on their soil, to send home Soviet and Cuban military personnel, to halt any support for guerrillas operating in other countries and to place restrictions on the force levels and weapons of their armed forces. The United States would not simply trust the Sandinistas to abide by these agreements. Of course not; rather, there would be means of verification and if the Sandinistas violated the agreements, the United States and other OAS countries would be in a position to take measures against Nicaragua under the provisions of

multilateral agreement and in full accordance with international law. By working through international conventions, the United States would be upholding international law and at the same time achieving our objectives in the area. That would be a tremendous improvement over present policy which neither upholds rule of law nor achieves U.S. objectives.

A change of policy is urgently needed. However it has from time to time attempted to disguise it, the Administration's present approach is one of trying to bring about the ouster or capitulation of the Sandinistas by force. This will not succeed unless the United States uses its own armed forces, with all the risks and consequences that implies. Yet, we do not have to oust the Sandinistas to secure our objectives; they can be achieved through multilateral diplomacy resulting in the sort of verifiable agreements outlined above. So far, however, while rhetorically supporting the Contadora process and other diplomatic openings, the Administration has in fact done everything it could to undermine them. As its objective has been to get rid of the Sandinistas, it has had no interest in any regional settlement which would have left them in power. Quite the contrary, it has sought to prevent any such accommodation. If the Administration holds to its present positions, the Contadora process cannot succeed—which is just what the Administration wants. It would thus be free to pursue its confrontational policies unencumbered by the compromises implied by negotiations, and since it is not a direct party to the Contadora process, it would avoid responsibility for the failure of that process.

The key to reversing that equation and opening the way to effective diplomacy, and the point on which opponents of the present policy could usefully concentrate their efforts, is to bring about the direct engagement of the United States in the process of multilateral negotiations. The logic of this is unassailable. If the United States feels such a strong responsibility for the outcome of the situation in Central America that it is willing to use force, then it stands to reason that it should also feel, and take, some responsibility for the outcome of the negotiating process. It makes no sense at all for the Administration constantly to emphasize how deeply interested we are in Central America, and how important are our security interests there, but at the same time to stand aside from diplomatic efforts to produce a peaceful solution. The United States should actively join the Contadora nations, the Central American states, and other interested parties, in a concerted effort to produce a regional accommodation satisfactory to all. If it does not, U.S. policy in Nicaragua will either fail or will lead to full-scale U.S. military involvement.

Sincerely,

WAYNE S. SMITH,
Scholar in Residence.

A VETO-PROOF PRESIDENT

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, today is day 503 in terrorist captivity for William Buckley, our Lebanon American Embassy political officer. It is day 450 in terrorist captiv-

ity for Rev. Benjamin Weir, who has now been held 6 days longer than the longest held of the 52 U.S. Embassy hostages in Tehran during the Presidency of Jimmy Carter. President Ronald Reagan does indeed have another serious hostage crisis on his hands. Instead of 52 Americans there are 7, equally as important to all of us, equally as precious to their families. We will not forsake them.

Mr. Speaker, the other reason I have asked to address my colleagues today is that I have in my hand a historical letter that makes the 40th President of our United States, Ronald Reagan, veto-proof in this House of Representatives, therefore veto-proof in this 99th Congress. A letter similar to this is being circulated on the Senate side to reinforce the statement to the liberal big spenders in this Congress that the President can and should veto any spending bill he chooses with no fear of override. Here are the signatures of 145 Members, plus 2.

They promise with their signature that they will sustain the veto of our President on any spending bill in this Congress that is a budget-buster.

I will read two paragraphs from the letter, and then insert the letter in the RECORD. The White House has asked me to hold this letter until the Congress comes back from the August district work period. This is an insurance policy under the President's pillow that this Congress will now have to be serious about spending cuts.

The letter starts "Mr. President, the overwhelming majority of the American people spoke loud and clear last November," 49 States' worth of overwhelming votes. "They want the deficit reduced through spending reductions, not tax increases. That is our goal, and we believe, as you do, that such an approach is necessary to achieve sustained economic prosperity.

The concluding paragraph, "Therefore, Mr. President, we, the undersigned Members of Congress will support your veto of any spending bill that fails to achieve serious deficit reduction * * *". The dynamics of power have changed. The President's veto mechanism is now fail safe.

Ronald Reagan is now a veto-proof President for the rest of this 99th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the full body of my letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 24, 1985.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The American people spoke loud and clear last November. They want the deficit reduced through spending reductions, not tax increases. That is our goal, and we believe, as you do, that such an approach is necessary to achieve sustained economic prosperity.

As Members of Congress who believe that serious efforts are needed to bring spending under control, we are concerned about,

indeed downright frustrated by, the intransigence of some Members to permit real spending reductions to be achieved.

The deadlocked House-Senate negotiations and the tendency of Congress to submit to special interest pressure have many of us questioning whether we will have a budget at all this year. In the event that the current deficit reduction effort fails, we believe it is important that you have a "failsafe" mechanism available so that progress on the deficit can still be made.

The more the budget negotiations drag on, the more apparent it becomes that a veto strategy may be the only way to get spending under control.

Therefore, Mr. President, we, the undersigned Members of Congress, will support your veto of any spending bill that fails to achieve serious deficit reductions, consistent with FY 1986 savings of some \$56 billion.

Again, Mr. President, we stand with you all the way.

Best regards,

ROBERT K. DORNAN.
DELBERT L. LATTI.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before declaring a recess the Chair will entertain special orders.

CATARACT SURGERY FRAUD, WASTE AND ABUSE: A LEGISLATIVE RESPONSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a package of reform legislation which I believe will correct a number of very serious problems brought to light by a recent investigation of the Subcommittee on Health and Long-Term Care of the House Select Committee on Aging and result in a savings to the Medicare Program of over \$4 billion during the next 3 years.

Results of the subcommittee's 2 year investigation, released at a hearing July 19, 1985, revealed massive amounts of fraud, waste, and abuse surrounding cataract surgery, the most common major surgical procedure paid for by the Medicare Program. We found that roughly half of the Nation's \$3.5 billion annual bill for cataract surgery is lost to fraud, waste, and abuse. Losses to the Medicare Program alone will total over \$1.5 billion this year.

Cataract surgery, which in 1981 required a 3-day stay in a hospital, now requires a 3-hour visit to a hospital on an outpatient basis. Improved surgical techniques and hospital cost containment have contributed largely to a shift from the hospital to an outpatient setting (either in the hospital or a free standing surgical clinic). Today 8 of 10 cataract operations are per-

formed on an outpatient basis. Intuitively, one would think that savings would accrue to the Medicare Program by eliminating hospital stays and the attendant services which accompany the stay. This has not been the case.

Medicare pays no less than \$2,400 for cataract surgery performed on an inpatient in the hospital basis where costs are controlled by the new prospective payment system [PPS]. When the same surgery is performed in the same hospital, even by the same doctor, but on an outpatient basis, Medicare is paying up to several times this amount—as much as \$5,700—for using only 3 hours of hospital resources. While PPS was intended to reduce Medicare costs by putting a limit on the amount paid for services provided in a hospital, the same rules don't apply to outpatient services. Medicare seems to be giving providers a "carte blanche" for what should be less expensive services.

Another factor fueling fraud, waste and abuse in cataract surgery relates directly to the price of the artificial lense or [IOL] implanted in the eye during the procedure and Medicare reimbursement practices associated with the IOL. In 1984, Medicare paid from \$300 to \$750 apiece for these lenses. The manufacturing cost for an average quality IOL is from \$35 to \$50. Under PPS, many hospitals have gone to competitive bidding for their IOL's and have reduced costs by over 50 percent to under \$100 per lense.

The first bill of my reform package, H.R. 3061, will end Medicare's senseless overpayment for cataract surgery performed on an outpatient basis by capping what it will pay for this surgery (including the cost of the IOL implanted) to some percentage less than the rate established under PPS for inpatient cataract surgery. This bill would save the Medicare Program over \$1 billion this year and at least \$4 billion over the next 3 years.

The second bill of the package calls for an annual review to be performed by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment of changes in technology and skill associated with artificial devices and organs and their implantation. The bill requires OTA to report to Congress how Medicare payments should be altered to reflect these changes. This would keep Medicare payments in line with rapidly changing technology and skills. Having no formal mechanism to do this has resulted in unreasonable and wasteful reimbursement. For example, the fee paid to physicians for cataract surgery is now around \$1,200. This rate was established prior to 1981 when the procedure took 3 hours. Now a surgeon can perform the same surgery in 20 to 30 minutes, but Medicare has not altered its payments.

It is obvious that with vast differences between the manufacturing cost

and the final price Medicare pays for these IOL's—as much as \$715—profit margins are high. We found that some manufacturers of these lenses are trying to stave off true competitive bidding by taking \$50 to \$150 out of their profits to buy off some physicians and gain a competitive edge. The subcommittee uncovered evidence of improper inducements, kickbacks, bribes, and other illegal marketing practices throughout the IOL industry. Inducements ranged from outright payments of cash to physicians, in the form of \$50 to \$100 deposits in foreign bank accounts, for each lense purchased, to free stock in the manufacturer, free lasers and other cataract surgery equipment, keys to resort condominiums, second homes, and medical skiing seminars.

Over 1 million IOL's will be implanted in the eyes of Americans in 1985, costing on the average of almost \$400 apiece. Medicare will pay for approximately 816,000 of these lenses at a cost of about \$325 million. Evidence gathered by the subcommittee suggests that half the price of each lense is lost to fraud and improper inducements resulting in a loss to the Medicare Program of about \$160 million this year. I believe that by including the IOL in a capped payment for outpatient surgery, as H.R. 3061 would do, much of this fraud will be eliminated.

We were distressed to learn that another type of improper inducement offered by IOL manufacturers to doctors performing cataract surgery, payments per lense for "phony" consultant work, has de facto approval from the Federal Government. The Food and Drug Administration [FDA] oversees the approval process for new IOL's. Manufacturers can pay doctors to serve as "investigators" implanting their as yet unapproved lenses and reporting any adverse consequences. The FDA has no controls over what is being paid to doctors and admits that they do not use the data provided by these "investigators." The subcommittee found that this has led to widespread use of "legalized kickbacks" to doctors simply for using a certain manufacturer's IOL.

The third and final bill of my reform package would limit what manufacturers could reimburse physician "investigators" to no more than what it reasonably costs the doctors in time over that required for normal patient care to serve as investigators (such as the filling out of forms or reporting of adverse consequences.) This will establish Government oversight which should effectively squeeze out what are now "legalized kickbacks" in the investigation of nonapproved medical devices.

At a moment in time when the Congress is struggling to find ways to reduce the soaring Federal deficit, often by making difficult and painful

program reductions, I cannot in good conscience ignore this grand scale squandering surrounding cataract surgery. I believe that with the changes called for in my package of legislation, we could continue to provide necessary and effective cataract surgery, enjoy its rich benefits, while saving the American taxpayer and the Medicare program over \$4 billion over the next 3 years.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this timely and important reform legislation. ●

RACKETEER WEAPONS AND VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Racketeer Weapons and Violent Crime Control Act of 1985, a crime fighting bill that will significantly strengthen our Nation's gun laws. Joining me in sponsoring this bill are Representatives WILLIAM HUGHES, BILL GREEN, and G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST.

This legislation will close a major loophole in the Gun Control Act of 1968 by providing a reasonable waiting period before a handgun can be purchased to ensure that criminals, drug addicts, mental incompetents, and other undesirables cannot get their hands on a gun. This is a critical crime control provision. It allows law enforcement agencies 15 days to check the records of a prospective purchaser of a handgun, and it provides time for an impassioned potential killer to "cool off."

This bill also bans the transfer and possession of machine guns and silencers, which are weapons of assassins and terrorists and have no sporting use at all. At the same time, it attempts to meet some of the concerns of sportsmen and gun dealers by lessening penalties for technical violations of gun regulations and eliminating paperwork that has no law-enforcement purpose.

As such, this is a balanced measure. It strengthens the gun laws with the goal of reducing crime, and it provides sportsmen and gun dealers relief from regulations not needed for crime control.

There is good reason why a waiting period is not only desirable but essential. The Gun Control Act of 1968 lists various classes of individuals that are not eligible to buy firearms. But Federal law currently offers no way to enforce this provision, except for an honor system in which the purchaser assures the gun dealer that he is not a drug addict or a felon. This enforcement loophole is best dramatized by

the history of the handgun used in the attempt to kill President Reagan. As the 1981 Attorney General's Task Force on Violent Crime states:

Since drug addicts, felons, mental defectives, and the like are not the best risk for the "honor system", a waiting period * * * is sensible and necessary to effect the purposes of the Act.

In other words, handguns must be kept out of the hands of the wrong people. This is a view strongly held by major law enforcement organizations, who have urged me to submit waiting period legislation and hold hearings on it. In letters to Members of Congress, these organizations—which include the Fraternal Order of the Police, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Troopers Coalition, the Police Foundation, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, and the Police Executive Research Forum—state that "there is an urgent need for stronger, not weaker, Federal handgun laws," and call for the adoption of a national waiting period.

They have good reason for their position: Two-thirds of all police who died in the line of duty last year were killed by handguns.

The waiting period is also popular with the American people. A 1981 Gallup Poll showed that 91 percent of Americans favor it. Newspapers around the country have endorsed it. And many sportsmen—tired of seeing reasonable law enforcement measures destroyed in their name—think it is a good idea.

Recent research bears out the need for a waiting period. Studies by the Rand Corp., indicate that a small number of repeat offenders commit a high proportion of the violent crimes—it is estimated that 6 percent of the offenders are responsible for 50 to 70 percent of the violent crimes. A reasonable waiting period, therefore, will enable the FBI and the local police to screen out these repeat offenders when they come to buy a handgun. The result can only be fewer crimes and better public safety.

Indeed, where waiting periods have been in effect, they have been highly effective. In the first 6 months the law was on the books in Broward County, FL, 37 prospective purchasers were prevented from buying a handgun. California's attorney general said that 1,200 felons were rejected in 1981.

Even the National Rifle Association has acknowledged the utility of a waiting period. In a pamphlet, "On Firearms Control," the NRA stated that "a waiting period could help in reducing crimes of passion and in preventing people with criminal records or dangerous mental illness from acquiring guns." The NRA notes that "a waiting period should be clearly specified, fixed, and reasonable in time, after which the firearm should be delivered

unless the purchaser is disqualified by the police." This is exactly the intent of my bill.

The handgun murder rate in America is 100 times greater than England's and 200 times greater than Japan's. Twenty-thousand Americans die from handguns each year, an average of over 50 handgun deaths per day. There are now over 60 million handguns in this country. One is sold every 12 seconds. America is being armed with handguns at an alarming rate. Handgun death has become a ghastly, depersonalized statistic. How many more violent crimes and deaths are necessary before we begin to put the brakes on this national tragedy? The waiting period is an idea whose time has come.

I do not claim this legislation will stop crime. But it could help curb the criminal violence that takes innocent lives and causes frightened citizens to arm themselves in a spiraling search for a balance of force against terror.

As a nation, we must do something about the fact that our staggering rate of handgun crime and death is a direct result of the ease with which any criminal can obtain a handgun. At stake, in the end, is the confidence of the people in the Government's ability to maintain the safety of its citizens. This bill will aid hunters and sportsmen and at the same time keep handguns—and machine guns—away from dangerous individuals. This is an approach that makes sense.

The Judiciary Committee will be holding hearings this fall on this bill and other legislation to amend the Gun Control Act of 1968.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on Friday, July 26, 1985. Had I been present, I would have voted:

"Yea" on roll No. 262, approval of the Journal for Thursday, July 25, 1985;

"Nay" on roll No. 263, House Joint Resolution 236, waiving certain points of order against the consideration of H.R. 3036, Treasury-Postal Services appropriations for fiscal year 1986;

"Yea" on roll No. 264, the Nelson Substitute to the Jacobs Amendment to Treasury-Postal Services appropriations for fiscal year 1986; and

"Yea" on roll No. 265, the Jacobs amendment as amended by the Nelson substitute to reduce the appropriation for allowances and office staff for former Presidents by \$219,400.●

HOUSE CREDIT UNION—A LEADER IN CUTTING CONSUMER LOAN COSTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body have complained that at a time when interest rates are falling rapidly in the business sector, there is no corresponding decrease in rates charged on consumer loans.

While the rates charged to consumers on loans have not decreased, there has been a severe decrease in the amount of interest paid to consumers on their savings accounts. Thus, consumers are facing a double load—lower rates on their savings and higher rates on their loans.

This trend has occurred throughout the country, but I am happy to report to the Members of this body that the Wright Patman Congressional Federal Credit Union, which serves the House of Representatives, is taking every opportunity to cut rates charged on consumer loans.

This year alone, the credit union has made across-the-board cuts in its consumer loan fees. And this week, the credit union took another bold step to cut loan costs. The credit union charges 18 percent a year on its outstanding loan balances for credit card accounts, a figure which already is among the lowest in the country; particularly when you consider that the credit union does not charge an annual fee for its card. On Tuesday, the credit union cut the credit card rate from 18 to 16.8 percent, and made the new rate available not just to new purchases, but on all existing credit card balances. This is an extra break for members who have outstanding balances. And, it is one of the first times that I have heard of a financial institution making a credit card reduction retroactive.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when financial institutions are being criticized by not cutting consumer loan rates, it is good to know that the House's very own financial institution is a leader in cutting consumer costs.●

PIVOTAL DAYS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MacKAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. MacKAY. Mr. Speaker, each year, after the session has concluded, and the dust has cleared, it becomes obvious that 1—or maybe 2 days were pivotal for the course of the entire year. Tuesday was such a day, and it would be wrong to continue business as usual, without at least a token rec-

ognition of the importance of Tuesday's events.

Tuesday, the leadership of both Houses of Congress formally gave up on the effort to deal significantly with our country's staggering budget deficits. They had been moving toward an across-the-board spending freeze, including defense and entitlements. Coupled with a modest tax on imported oil, this would have balanced the Federal budget in 3½ years.

That leaves our budget conferees trying to appear serious about deficit reduction, with defense, entitlements, and revenues off the table. The result will be marginal at best. In fact, the odds are that by next January this year's so-called \$50 billion deficit reduction package will be totally irrelevant. By that time, it will be clear that next year's budget deficit will still be \$200 billion, and that within a year, the international trade deficit, which is a direct result of our reckless fiscal policy, will make America the biggest debtor nation in the history of the world.

For those who think the trade deficit is a kind of esoteric economic term, I invite you to look closely at the agonizing decisions now facing the Governments of Mexico and Brazil, our fellow debtors. Those governments are being required to restrict imports and maximize exports in order to pay their debts.

Clearly, the people of Mexico and Brazil are having to reduce their living standards in 1985, to pay the bills run up by the reckless spending of their governments in the seventies.

Just as clearly, the time is short until America's citizens are going to have to reduce their living standards to pay the bills for this government's reckless spending.

Already the political columnists are analyzing last Tuesday decision, to see which party won, and which lost. When the full impact of America's new status as the world's leading debtor is felt, the answer will be clear: Nobody won last Tuesday. All of us lost, and particularly our young people whose living standards will have to be reduced, to pay the bills for our reckless spending. ●

TRIBUTE TO HERBERT SCOVILLE, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MAVROULES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, a brilliant and caring man passed away earlier this week. Herbert Scoville, Jr.—known to most everyone as "Pete"—died on Tuesday, July 30, at the age of 70. Those of us who had the privilege to know Pete will never forget his uniquely compassionate and inspiring manner. Above all, though, I

am certain the world will remember him as a man with a rare sense of social responsibility and a restless mind ever searching for better ways to lessen global tensions and conflict—a true champion of peace.

Among the many well-deserved tributes that may be paid to Pete Scoville, I should like to say that he especially deserves recognition for his valuable contributions to the cause of nuclear arms control. Throughout his professional life, Pete maintained a tremendous vision and hope for a world free from the specter of nuclear war. He very ably combined and applied his unusual talent, drive, scientific expertise and government experience to this pursuit.

Regretfully, I cannot possibly do justice to the full breadth and depth of his professional life, but I will take the time to point out some of the highlights of Pete's outstanding record of service to this country within the Federal Government, a prominent phase within a long and illustrious career of public service. To name a few of the many positions he held from the mid-1940's through the 1960's, he served as: Director for Science and Technology in the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; Assistant Director for Scientific Intelligence and Deputy Director for Research in the Central Intelligence Agency; technical director of the Armed Forces special weapons project in the Department of Defense; senior scientist on the Los Alamos contract in the Atomic Energy Commission; a member of the National Defense Research Committee; and a consultant to the President's Science Advisory Committee.

I should like to focus on a particular aspect of Pete Scoville's role in the field of nuclear arms control during his time in the Government—his critical and lasting contributions to both the concept and the design of independent treaty verification procedures. Pete Scoville earned his Ph.D. in physical chemistry during World War II—as the first nuclear weapons made their terrifying debut before the world. Shortly thereafter, he joined an effort shared by American scientists and policymakers searching to find the safest ways to deal with birth of these weapons into a world rife with conflict. Through these early experiences, Pete Scoville became a strong believer and a committed exponent of the need for bilateral arms control agreements. From the start, it was clear to arms control advocates that perhaps the greatest difficulty that would obstruct successful negotiations was the lack of independent means of verifying agreements. Under the direction of Pete Scoville, U.S. intelligence programs successfully produced crucial independent technical means of treaty verification, which significantly lessened the need to rely on onsite in-

spection. The existence of countless arms control agreements in force today—the Hotline agreement, Limited Test Ban Treaty, Outer Space Treaty, Nonproliferation Treaty, ABM Treaty—to name a few—all depend in large measure on this crucial verification technology. Putting this in perspective, we begin to appreciate the tremendous contributions made by scientific experts who are genuinely and innovatively committed to arms control, as Pete Scoville was.

In closing I would like to call upon my colleagues today to join me in remembering and honoring Pete Scoville, with great respect and gratitude, for his outstanding service to his country, his ideals and the pursuit of peace. ●

● Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I rise today in commemoration of the beloved Herbert Scoville, Jr., whom many of us had the privilege to work with in his untiring efforts to promote international cooperation and world peace. Specifically, I would like to highlight the later years of Pete's life—to recognize the immeasurable contribution he made to the public movement to bring the arms race under control.

Following an outstanding scientific career in the U.S. Government, Pete Scoville devoted the last 15 years of his life working with numerous public interest organizations and campaigns committed to arms control and the prevention of nuclear war. For example, Pete Scoville was one of the principal founders and served as president of the Arms Control Association, a wing of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; he was an active board member of the Center for Defense Information, the Council for a Livable World and the Union of Concerned Scientists among others; and he was a key initiator of many important public campaigns such as the National Campaign to Stop the MX and the National Campaign to Save the ABM Treaty.

Through all these ties, Pete devoted much of his time and energy to educating the public on the nuclear threat and on ways that citizens can work together to reduce it. Pete was able to teach us to treat this most profound issue seriously, but not to despair. He inspired people to join him in a struggle for change.

"Patience," "clarity," "dedication," and "strength" are just some of the words that come to mind when we think of how Pete Scoville presented his message to the American public. In spite of his two illnesses, arthritis and cancer, he never stopped encouraging and teaching others to use their minds and their political powers effectively. Health permitting—he maintained a busy schedule of speaking tours across the country. Without question, Pete

was a "mover" in the arms control community at large.

Pete Scoville made us understand that global peace—or rather the constant and growing struggle to achieve global peace—is inescapably linked with the most important and fundamental institutions of humanity. To explain his deep and driving personal commitment to this struggle, let me repeat some words of his own on the subject. The following is a brief statement he made in 1981 when accepting the prestigious Rockefeller Public Service Award. On that occasion, he said:

Without peace we will never achieve the goals that my fellow award recipients have worked so effectively for—goals of a better life for the children of this world, more satisfying family relationships, more stimulating and more secure employment opportunities, and for improved health for all. Yet this simple truism is largely ignored as the world concentrates its energies, its resources, its manpower and its wealth on more devastating ways to wage war, on more efficient means of causing death. Just to show that I can be optimistic, there really is a strong, public ferment against this nuclear madness at last brewing across the country and across the world. It must be nurtured, it must be fertilized, and propagated across the lands. This award, in my view, is a recognition of its vital importance. Let us fervently hope that the public outcry will be in time.

Pete Scoville was indeed a man of great humility, wisdom and foresight. We will miss him very dearly. Mr. Speaker, I hope we shall do justice to the legacy of this very special man by remembering him and his message of peace—and most importantly, by heeding his message through our actions.

At this point I would also like to submit for the RECORD the following statement presented on Herbert Scoville's behalf, for his nomination as the recipient of the 1981 Rockefeller Public Service Award.

NOMINATION OF HERBERT SCOVILLE, JR.

Dr. Herbert Scoville, Jr., is especially deserving of the 1981 Rockefeller Public Service Award, not only because he embodies in full measure the "courage, sensitivity, and vision" which John D. Rockefeller sought to find and promote in establishing the awards, but also because he has contributed significantly to the international search for cooperation and peace through distinguished careers in both public and private service.

Earning his doctorate in physical chemistry during World War II, Dr. Scoville was one of many scientists who helped earn that conflict the appellation of "Wizard War"—a label that might as well be applied, with less approving connotations, to the potential nuclear conflict that has hung like a dark cloud over mankind ever since 1945. In the middle 1950s—when the advent of thermonuclear weapons and intercontinental missiles made it clear beyond doubt that warfare had entered a decisively new era of sudden destructiveness—Herbert Scoville turned his considerable scientific ability and talent for persuasion to the task of achieving controls over and reductions in these new weapons of mass destruction. Up to

that time, the United States, the Soviet Union and other states had sought through disarmament talks in the United Nations to put back in the bottle the awful genie released by nuclear fission and fusion. Part sincere, part rhetorical, and always conducted in a corrosive atmosphere of fear, these talks had proved increasingly fruitless. The marriage of hydrogen weapons to long-range missiles started a new tremor of concern, of fear that the weapons could end civilization as we have known it and that man could find no means to avoid such a fate.

Dr. Scoville, or Pete, as he is known to thousands who have heard and been touched by him, attended the East-West Surprise Attack Conference of 1958 and has spoken of the oppressive weight felt by many of the participants as they realized fully the difficult but unavoidable responsibility they shared for finding a means of resolving the existential dilemma of nuclear weapons in a world of acute hostility and tension. Out of such experiences was born the concept of arms control and Pete Scoville was one of its midwives. His contribution was of two kinds. He was a persistent advocate of arms control within the government. Moreover, and at least equally important, he was a director of and major contributor to efforts to find ways of independently verifying arms control agreements, that is, without the necessity of onsite inspection which had proved one of the most inpenetrable obstacles to agreements to limit or reduce nuclear and thermonuclear weapons.

It is not often appreciated, even today, that the advances arms limitation was able to achieve in the 1960s and 1970s—the Hot-Line Agreement, the Limited Test Ban Treaty, the Outer Space Treaty, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Seabed Treaty, the Interim Offensive Weapons Agreement, the ABM Treaty, the Biological Weapons Convention, the Threshold Test Ban, the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty, the Environmental Modification Convention, and SALT II—depend in some measure on independent means of verification, for which the technology was largely pioneered by the United States. The development of this technology was not an accident and was in large measure in the hands of Dr. Scoville. He worked on this problem for eight years as Director of Research and Assistant Director for Scientific Intelligence at the Central Intelligence Agency (1955-1963). Not long after the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was established late in 1961, he was appointed Assistant Director for Science and Technology and continued to build the all-important technical base on which all successful arms limitation to date has rested. While others, especially those outside of government disputed the merits of arms reduction and limitation, Dr. Scoville was an increasingly important figure among that small band of men and women who were doing something positive to achieve it in a quite but practical way. His work earned him no accolades, or recognition as statesman or peacemaker; outside of the small group seriously pursuing arms control his name was scarcely known. Yet his scientific acumen and judgment and his perseverance made it possible for others to gain public applause as the promoters of arms limitation, especially nuclear arms limitation. These are the hallmarks of courage, vision, and sensitivity in confronting possibly the most dire collective threat that mankind has ever faced.

Though it is difficult to judge such different things, perhaps the more courageous

part of Pete Scoville's lifelong career of science in the public service began when he left ACDA in 1969. Since that time, he has been a tireless and articulate advocate of arms control, a knowledgeable originator of arms limitation concepts and proposals, and an inestimable source of inspiration and support to all others who see the essential rationality of negotiated security. He has put all this scientific knowledge and political wisdom in the service of arms control and reduction. Withal, he has been during this time crippled by arthritis and must walk with two canes. Refusing any special treatment, Pete Scoville has made of his canes symbols of courageous pursuit of a vision of a more cooperative and less fearful world.

His reputation is both national and international. He has served on numerous official arms control delegations and advisory panels. He has conducted many private conferences on the entire range of arms limitation issues. He has actively participated in nearly all Washington-based organizations seeking to create public awareness of the contribution of arms control to American and international security; he has advised countless other organizations, universities, and research institutes in this country and abroad. He originated the Arms Control Program of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and was a founder of the Arms Control Association, of which he is now President.

In addition to his work with private and official organizations, Dr. Scoville has been a tireless writer on arms limitation. His articles appear not only in specialized journals but also, and more frequently, in newspapers and periodicals where they are available to the broader public. He has written two books—one an explanation of strategic weapons and the other on the MX missile system—and has contributed to several others. Dr. Scoville's public speaking schedule has been at least as full as his writing program; he has addressed audiences throughout the United States, as well as in Europe and Asia, again making no distinction between attentive and mass audiences. At the same time, he has also remained available to discuss the issues of arms control at length with the press or with students and other researchers. Each year he is called upon to testify before Congress on some aspect of arms limitation, usually not once but several times.

It would be difficult indeed to find an exponent of the limitation of weapons of mass destruction who has been more prolific and persevering than Pete Scoville or who has been at such pains to explain this seemingly complex subject to the layman. He has dedicated his experience, his scientific insight, and his considerable energy not just to a safer and more cooperative world but to explaining to people in comprehensible terms how such a world can be achieved. He has given hope and inspiration to the many who labor under the fear of wholesale destruction or the end of the kind of society and values that man has sought with such constant difficulty.

In all this, Pete Scoville has retained two essential characteristics: his humanity and his scientific standards. He remains a warm, humorous, and congenial individual equally at ease in any situation and equally respected by advocates and skeptics of arms control. Pete has also been at considerable pains to ensure that, in his writing and speaking, his discussion of technical matters is scientifically correct; he will not compro-

mise his scientific training and standards to facilitate his arguments, which continue to be based on a deep and certain knowledge of the science and technology that are involved.

He continues to read deeply and widely in the field and increases his own knowledge as he increases that of others. Pete does not merely clamor for an end to the burden of the secret of nuclear weapons, he provides practical answers to this problem that are consistent with both technology and politics. He was, for example, the most persistent advocate in the late 1960s and early 1970s for flight test and deployment limitations on the multiple, independently targetable re-entry vehicle, an innovation which nearly all now concede has severely prejudiced U.S. and international security and fueled the qualitative strategic competition.

The progress that has been achieved to date in arms limitation and that must be achieved in the future if man is to avoid the destruction of modern society owe a large debt to the efforts of this one man. While others have contributed as specialists to this achievement, Pete Scoville has contributed as both specialist and explicator. It can be said with considerable confidence that no American has done more to carry the message of arms limitation to the broadest possible audience; in a democracy, this is essential.

Alfred North Whitehead wrote that "Duty arises out of our potential control over events." Perhaps no duty today is more significant than our potential control over the events we call collectively the arms race. Without effective effort in this area, other human activity to improve our condition would become largely irrelevant. Few indeed have seen this duty more clearly, pursued it more vigorously or with more vision, or shown more humility and humanity in their dedication to a peaceful world free of the threat of nuclear destruction than Herbert Scoville, Jr. ●

PEANUT PRICE SUPPORT AMENDMENTS OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNDINE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Peanut Price Support Amendments of 1985. This bill will eliminate the current system of poundage quotas for peanuts and substitute a straightforward loan support program parallel to those for corn, wheat, soybeans, rice, and other crops.

The Lundine amendment to the Food and Agriculture Act of 1981 passed the House by a 91-vote margin, essentially with similar provisions to those proposed this year. Unfortunately, a similar amendment offered in the Senate by Senator LUGAR failed by four votes. Since the problems with the peanut program which existed in 1981 continue to exist today, I hope my colleagues will reaffirm their support of these reforms again this year.

The current program of Government controls for peanuts designates two classes of peanuts—quota peanuts for domestic use and additional for

export. This complicated program results in artificially high peanut product prices for U.S. consumers and an injustice to thousands of farmers denied the right to grow peanuts for the U.S. edible market.

The Government's two-tier price system establishes a higher support price—\$550 a ton—for domestic edible peanuts—quota peanuts—and a lower support price (\$185 per ton) for export, feed, meal, and oil peanuts—additional.

This program allows only those farmers who hold poundage quotas the legal right to grow edible peanuts for U.S. consumption. Since these poundage quotas are set by the Federal Government well below U.S. demand for edible peanuts, the price paid for raw peanuts in this country is about two times greater than the price paid for U.S. peanuts exported to other countries.

American farmers are prohibited from growing peanuts for the domestic edible market unless they were enfranchised with that right when the peanut program began in the 1930's, or have purchased the right from the original quota holder at significant cost.

This bill will eliminate the artificial distinction between quota and additional peanuts. The Secretary of Agriculture would be required to establish one level price support that would apply to all peanuts. In establishing this level, the Secretary would be required to take into consideration such factors as the cost of production and world market prices, as well as supply and demand for peanuts.

Current law gives peanut growers who hold poundage quotas a far better deal than other farmers receive. An American Peanut Product Manufacturers Institute study estimated that peanut price supports "have been set 80 percent above USDA defined production costs . . . when land costs are excluded, and 60 percent above when the inflated costs of land are included."

It is the American consumer who must bear the cost of this feudal program. Agricultural economist Merrill J. Bateman, Ph.D., testified earlier this year before the House Agriculture Committee's Subcommittee on Tobacco and Peanuts, on the adverse effect of the peanut program on the U.S. consumer. Bateman said:

The constricted supply of raw peanuts, coupled with a high price-support level, has ensured that the American consumer is paying more than necessary for peanut products. While the current program is not a substantial drain on the Treasury, it does add some \$250 million each year to the nation's food bill through a consumer subsidy or "hidden tax" on peanut products.

We now have further evidence that because the 1985 crop of peanuts is larger than usual, due to good growing

conditions, the cost to the Treasury will be significantly higher this year.

The price for peanut butter, which is an important source of protein and a dietary staple for many low-income families, is inflated because of the current program. USDA data indicates that 12 peanut quota holders earn an additional \$250,000 each year as a result of the consumer subsidy on peanut products, which adds 13.5 percent to the cost of every jar of peanut butter sold in America. In fact, American consumers would save between \$250 to \$300 million annually if the current peanut price support program were eliminated. Clearly, American consumers are underwriting the low cost of peanuts enjoyed by foreign consumers by paying higher domestic prices for the same quality U.S. product.

While supporters of peanut subsidies may argue that the cost of peanut products is more significantly influenced by the cost of ingredients other than peanuts, prices of finished peanut products have closely reflected raw peanut prices, both up and down. For example, as a result of the 1980 drought, raw peanut prices increased due to reduced supply and the price of peanut products at the consumer level increased accordingly. Conversely, when the weather improved in 1981, supplies increased and consumer product prices declined.

If the present system of Government controls is eliminated in favor of the plan I have proposed, domestic consumption of peanuts could increase by about 200 million pounds annually. This translates into nearly 1 pound of additional roasted or salted peanuts, peanut butter, and other highly nutritious peanut products per U.S. consumer.

It is no wonder that peanut growers who can produce peanuts for 15 cents per pound and are guaranteed more than 28 cents per pound by the Government would work to keep the current program. However, Government interference in peanut production is not in the best interest of consumers, nor those farmers who wish to grow peanuts for the domestic market and who are currently prohibited from doing so. The abolition of Government controls on the supply and marketing of peanuts would ensure consumers of an adequate supply at reasonable prices, increase efficiency within the peanut industry and keep U.S. peanut producers competitive with foreign growers.

I believe that this bill offers a fair and equitable arrangement for both peanut producers and consumers and I urge my colleagues to support it. ●

THE NATIONAL PLANNING FOR PEACE COMMISSION ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, after the travail we have just gone through over the budget resolution, I hardly need to belabor the point when I say that the Congress is today faced with extraordinarily difficult choices about how to reduce the huge Federal deficits which we have run up over the past few years. The magnitude of the problem is so great that we often lose track of the impact of spending cutbacks on the American public. This is the case not just with reductions in various human services programs, but with the impact of cutbacks for Government procurement on Americans whose jobs are intertwined with Federal spending.

Defense spending is clearly out of control, with a self-generating momentum that defies efforts to make significant reductions. One reason making cuts in defense is so difficult is that, whether we like to acknowledge it or not, the defense budget is the largest public works program the Nation has ever known. Every Federal contract for weapons procurement provides jobs for Americans. And every time we try to eliminate overpriced, outmoded, or inefficient weapons systems, Members of Congress are faced with the possibility of job losses in their congressional districts.

If we were to set up a national program which provided Federal assistance and expertise to communities facing dislocations because of shifts in Federal spending, we could minimize the disruptions which such shifts may cause. Such a program would in turn make it easier for the Congress to assess defense programs strictly on their merits.

We already have a name for such a program: "economic conversion." Indeed, economic conversion has been the subject of a great deal of discussion in recent years, but not much action. Thus far, almost nothing has been done in a practical way at the Federal level to facilitate the development of a rational economic conversion plan. Our colleagues TED WEISS and NICHOLAS MAVROULES have both introduced economic conversion legislation in the 99th Congress, as they have in previous years. I am a cosponsor of both bills. Their legislation deserves our consideration and support. It is needed to deal with the very real problems faced by communities, defense industries, and their workers, when cutbacks or changes in military plans shut down bases or military procurement programs. But economic conversion should be seen as more

than simply damage limitation. It is also a great opportunity.

Why, in the face of all the evidence that absolute military superiority is unachievable, do we and the Soviets continue to spend ever larger amounts of money on ever more exotic weapons? Why, on the 40th anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima, is it seemingly impossible for us to agree on sensible cuts in nuclear weapons? In a brilliant article in the September, 1983 edition of Harvard magazine, the distinguished author, Francois Leydet, suggests that the answer is simply because neither the leaders of the United States nor the Soviet Union have the wisdom or courage to believe that such cuts are really possible.

As Leydet notes, we and the Soviets have become "nukeaholics," addicted to the arms race and unable to believe that it can be stopped, just as hopeless alcoholics are unable to believe they can stop drinking. Says Leydet:

Before the alcoholic can stop drinking, he must believe it can be done, and he must believe that life without alcohol will be better than life with it. There must, in other words, be a shift of perception, a change in his subjective reality. The same applies to the nukeaholic.

What will it take to bring about that shift of perception that will enable the nukeaholics to get off their arms race binge? An impartial observer from another planet might expect that the very real danger of mutual suicide in a nuclear holocaust would be enough. Today, 40 years after Hiroshima, the threat has reached mind-boggling proportions. Yet the superpowers seem as far as ever from kicking their nuclear habit. Perhaps because the threat has never materialized—except for the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki—it does not yet produce the kind of utter desperation that brings an alcoholic to the outlook that makes his recovery possible.

The cost of the arms race does, of course, affect most of us in a very immediate way, through higher taxes, inflation, enormous deficits, cutbacks in human services, and the loss of business and jobs to countries, like Japan, that are not pouring their human and material resources down the military drain. The doubling of our national debt to \$2 trillion in only 5 years is but one measure of the enormous cost of the arms race to the people of the United States. And, as we in Congress know only too well, that cost continues to mount at an ever-increasing rate, despite all efforts to get it under control.

A few days ago, I inserted into the RECORD a speech by the president of Time Inc., in which he pointed out the connection between the arms race and the loss of American business to foreign competitors. The people of the Soviet Union are paying an equally heavy price for the continued diver-

sion of a huge portion of their smaller national economic resources to the maintenance of their war machine.

Unfortunately, because of the complexity of national and international economic relationships, it is difficult for people, even in the United States, to get a very clear picture of the cost each nation is paying for our collective failure to bring an end to the arms race. Yet, if we are to achieve the psychological shift needed to extricate ourselves from this predicament, we are going to need a detailed, coherent plan showing what could be done with the resources that could be reallocated as a result of genuine disarmament.

Mr. Leydet, in his article, states that it is time we developed such a plan and challenged the Soviets to make similar plans of their own. He puts it this way:

Once both of us, Americans and Russians, have developed a clear, coherent picture of what we would like to do with the vast natural, financial, and human resources we are now squandering on the arms race, it will be time to sit down together and compare notes. That's the conference that might really lead to disarmament.

The task of envisioning a future and of making concrete plans for it, in which our respective resources are allocated to peaceful rather than warlike purposes, must start now, long before anything tangible comes out of the Geneva talks. Mind you, the two processes are in no way incompatible; rather, they need to be simultaneous and synergic.

As things stand today, the most telling sign that the present regimes in Washington and Moscow have no faith in, or commitment to, a serious disarmament strategy is the total absence of any planning for peace.

The clearest signal we could give the Soviets (and they to us) that we are serious about peace would be to come up with a well-thought-out plan for the reallocation of resources once we have agreed to a freeze, followed by a gradual, annually increasing cutback in military spending.

At present, we have no clear idea how we would reallocate Federal resources currently slated for defense if we and the Soviets reached agreement on substantial arms reductions. Would we cut taxes? Increase funding for job training? Improve our health care system? Upgrade our schools? The possibilities are limited only by our imagination. Once we develop a clear idea how we might best reallocate resources at the Federal level, we can work out a comprehensive national plan for helping communities, defense industries, and the Nation to make an easy transition from our long binge of military spending.

With these thoughts in mind, I am today introducing the National Planning for Peace Commission Act of 1985. The Commission, comprised of 20 leading experts on the economy and economic conversion, from Government, business, labor, and the academic communities, would be charged with assessing the pressing national needs

that we are not currently able to meet because of defense spending, with evaluating changes in Federal tax and other policies that would facilitate a shift from defense spending to meeting such needs, and with helping communities and businesses adjust to an economy not dominated by the arms race.

Other than the Secretaries of Defense, Labor, Commerce, and Health and Human Services, all members of the Commission would be appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate. The Commission would be empowered to hold hearings and meetings around the country, if necessary. Its ultimate goal would be the development of an economic conversion blueprint for congressional consideration. This plan would be due in 2 years. Although the Commission would go out of existence after 2 years, my bill would require regular updates of the economic conversion master plan by a working group comprised of representatives of the Departments of Energy, Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Education, Labor, Commerce, and Health and Human Services, as well as the Office of Management and Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Council on Environmental Quality.

The National Planning for Peace Commission Act of 1985 is not an alternative to the Weiss or Mavroules bills. It is, however, a companion piece. Its enactment would draw national attention to the need for better adjustment planning for communities, bring about a plan for the reallocation of Federal resources and economic adjustment, and build a national consensus in favor of such a plan. This is not simply a bill to appeal to liberal "peace activists." Changes in defense spending strike me as inevitable, and enactment of my bill could provide the Congress with the best information and the best possible recommendations of how to curtail or redirect Federal spending to maximize its productive use, how to assist constituents to deal with the adjustments of a real disarmament program, and, most important, how the enormous resources released from the arms race could produce higher living standards and a more stable, prosperous nation.

Of course, conversion need not be limited to military-related factories. For example, the U.S. Department of Energy recently decided to abandon the gaseous centrifuge enrichment plant [GCEP] in Portsmouth, OH, and to walk away from a \$3 billion investment in the centrifuge technology. This decision adversely affects between 600 to 1,200 workers in Portsmouth, OH, as well as over 700 jobs elsewhere in the State, and leaves idle and unused a Federal facility which has been under construction for the

last 10 years. With a comprehensive conversion plan in place, the Federal Government would be better set for quick action to minimize the kind of disruption the GCEP decision will inevitably cause in the lives of the workers, their families, and the communities in which they live. And an existing Federal economic conversion plan could help ensure that the taxpayers' GCEP plant would be quickly put to productive use instead of sitting idle and wasted.

It is high time that we acknowledged the need for a national economic conversion plan, and moved ahead to develop one.

The full text of the Leydet article follows:

PLANNING FOR PEACE

(By Francois G. Laydet)

The French have a facetious saying: "L'alcool tue lentement. Nous, on s'en fout, on n'est pas pressé" ("Alcohol kills slowly. We don't give a damn, we're in no hurry"). When I contemplate the real costs of the arms race to us, to our Soviet adversaries, and to the rest of the world, that French phrase keeps haunting me.

There is a "rest of the world," you know. Nearly 90 percent of humanity is neither American nor Russian, yet its future is held hostage in the confrontation of the superpowers. It is a world of immense beauty, immense variety, immense potential—and immense problems. It is a world ravaged by cancers of hunger, disease, runaway population growth, and environmental decay.

While we and our Soviet partners, interlocked in our danse macabre, with eyes only for one another, with ears only for the strains of the security-through-strength martial bands, whirl ever closer to the final abyss, all these processes of planetary degradation go unattended for lack of concern, lack of commitment, and lack of funds. Prisoners of our ideologies, obsessed with a thirst for unachievable military security, which we indulge at the expense of social and life-support systems that are every bit as vital to long-term security, we and the Russians remain unable or unwilling to face the fact that these global trends, if not reversed, will do us in just as surely as a nuclear holocaust will. We just shrug: "Nous, on s'en fout, on n'est pas pressé."

Most experts on the disease of alcoholism agree that if an alcoholic wants to turn his life around, the first thing he has to do is to stop drinking. Only then can he begin to deal with all the other problems his drinking has caused or enabled him to ignore. You can say the same thing about what I've come to call *nuke-aholism*. We have got to stop nuclear arms race before we can begin to address effectively the ills that beset our society, Soviet society, and the society of mankind in general.

But before the alcoholic can stop drinking, he must believe it can be done, and he must believe that life without alcohol will be better than life with it. There must, in other words, be a shift of perception, a change in his subjective reality. The same applies to the *nukeaholic*.

Do you feel, as I do, that it is time we sobered up? That we need to get off this catastrophic arms race binge? If so, you will perhaps agree we might try to view the U.S.-Soviet stand-off from a different angle.

In the final chapter, "Coming up for Air," of a Union of Concerned Scientists book titled *Beyond the Freeze: The Road to Nuclear Sanity*, there is a paragraph that states:

"The threat of nuclear holocaust has been a fact of life for so long that it seems naïve to contemplate plans the United States and U.S.S.R. can make once that danger recedes. Yet it may be the attractiveness of those plans that convinces the two superpowers of the need to abandon the costly arms race [emphasis added], for both the dream of affluence in the capitalist United States and the promise of a socialist utopia in the U.S.S.R. are in great jeopardy. Both countries are beset by grave domestic problems that are growing all the worse because of the massive drain on their resources for military purposes."

I italicize one sentence in that paragraph because it seems to suggest the very mind shift that is essential if we and our Soviet rivals are to extricate ourselves from the arms race. I submit that it is time right now for us to start making plans—real, detailed, coherent plans—for the eventual reallocation of our resources.

It is time right now for us to challenge the Soviets to make similar plans of their own.

Once both of us, Americans and Russians, have developed a clear, coherent picture of what we would like to do with the vast natural, financial, and human resources we now are squandering on the arms race, it will be time to sit down together and compare notes. That's the conference that might really lead to disarmament.

Both we and the Russians would need to approach this conference table sans truculence, sans braggadocio, sans recriminations and accusations about who was to blame for launching and perpetrating and escalating the Cold War. We both would need to enter these discussions with a spirit of humility, a recognition of being in a common mess, a sincere desire to help one another out of our predicament and to invest a part of our released resources, human and material, in what David Brower, archdruid of the environmental movement, has called a Marshall Plan for the Planet.

"Look," we'd say to the Russians, "our whole infrastructure—the vast, vital network of roads, bridges, sewers, rails, and mass-transit systems—is heading towards collapse. The cost of needed repairs around the country could run to \$3 trillion. Where will we find that kind of money?"

"You think you've got it tough," the Russians might answer us. "We don't even have the network we need of roads and bridges and sewers and rails. It's so bad that much of our agricultural product is lost because we can't get it to market. We need 3 trillion rubles. Where will we find that?"

"We've got a big problem on our southern border," we'd throw in. "The only way to stop the horde of illegal immigrants, short of stationing a million-man army on the Mexican border, would be to help Mexico straighten out its economy so its people could find jobs at home and wouldn't need to come north. But that means foreign aid on a major scale. Where's that money to come from?"

"We're so strapped we can't even consider foreign aid on any significant scale," the Russians would reply. "And yet we're well aware of the needs of the Third World. But what can we do?"

"Do you suppose the arms control boys in Geneva could help us out?" we might ask.

"They will—if we both lean on them good and hard," the Russians might answer.

A naive fantasy? Perhaps not.

What I am suggesting is that there is a lot of work to be done, on our side and on the Soviet side, to prepare for peace. This work needs to be just as hard-headed and just as detailed as the preparations being made by our respective military establishments for a possible war. And it goes far beyond the goal of the Geneva arms control talks, which is to avert nuclear war. Indispensable as that goal is, both we and the Russians need to remind ourselves that there is much more to real peace than the mere absence of war. The task of envisioning a future, and of making concrete plans for it, in which our respective resources are allocated to peaceful rather than war-like purposes, must start now, long before anything tangible comes out of the Geneva talks. Mind you, the two processes are in no way incompatible; rather, they need to be simultaneous and synergistic.

As things stand today, the most telling sign that the present regimes in Washington and Moscow have no faith in, or commitment to, a serious disarmament strategy is the total absence of any planning for peace.

The clearest signal we could give the Soviets (and they to us) that we are serious about peace would be to come up with a well-thought-out plan for the reallocation of resources once we have agreed to a freeze, followed by a gradual, annually increasing cutback in military spending.

The most persuasive evidence Congress could give that it considers real peace to be at least a possibility would be passage of a bill such as H.R. 229, the Defense Economic Adjustment Act. The purpose of this bill is to help prepare communities, industries, and workers for a transition to civilian production should the day come when, as a result of international arms control agreements, there would be substantial reductions in defense contracts.

But we'll never do any of this unless we break out of our hypnotic trance. Just over two centuries have passed since we declared our independence from Great Britain. I think the time now has come to declare our independence from the Soviet Union (and vice versa). In a sense, much of our policy is made not in Washington but in Moscow. Obsessed by what we observe Russia to be doing, by what we think she may be doing, by what we think she may be thinking of doing, we have lost our independence of action. We cultivate dubious friendships abroad; we squander our resources at home on military hardware; we neglect the most fundamental material, social, and spiritual underpinnings of our society—not because we prefer to do so but because we have convinced ourselves that the Kremlin allows us no other options. We've let expediency subvert our ideals, fear cloud our vision, reflexes abort reflection, frantic scrambles to cope with the crisis of the month divert us from creative, imaginative planning for the kind of future we choose.

It is high time, I submit, that we stop blaming the Russians for all of our and the world's ills, that we get our eyes off them for a while, that we make a priority of putting our own house in order, that we take a good hard look at our own deficiencies, that we develop a vision of what a peaceful America—and eventually a peaceful world—would mean in specific terms, not just as a romantic ideal.

Besides continuing to press for a nuclear weapons freeze, there is nothing of greater moment that the "peace movement" in this

country could do in the immediate future than to draw up a preliminary blueprint for a conversion to a peace economy.

To help us in the task we will need to enlist the help of like-minded experts in the business, labor, academic, environmental, educational, and political communities.

Assume, we would tell them, that an agreement could be negotiated with the Soviets that would bind each side to reduce its defense expenditures over a ten-year period from the present annual level of \$200 billion plus to perhaps \$20 billion. Assume that each side would agree to invest the money thus saved in economically productive, socially useful, environment-enhancing programs, including greatly stepped-up aid to "have-not" countries for ecologically sound development. These programs would be mutually verifiable, and would provide hard evidence of the cutback in military spending since such a cutback would be the only possible source for the funding.

Assume all this to be true, we would tell our experts. You have hundreds of billions—eventually trillions—of dollars to play with. How can they do most good? How can they be invested to rehabilitate our decrepit infrastructure, to rejuvenate our industrial plants, to speed the transition to a renewable energy base, to halt the erosion of our topsoils, to preserve our natural and scenic resources, to salvage our decaying cities, to extend medical care to all, to upgrade our standards of education, to put our unemployed—including our hard-core unemployed—to work, to give to all our people a new hope, a new interest in the future, a sense that they are needed, a sense that there is work, important work, for them to do—work that would, incidentally, offer ample profits to interested private enterprise?

How much, we would ask the experts, of the money saved from defense could we afford to invest in helping to assure that peoples throughout the world have at least the minimum requirements for a fully human existence? How much could we allocate to the protection and repair of the essential natural life-support systems of the planet? How could we extend massive foreign aid to developing nations, regardless of the ideologies of their governments, but with sufficient controls to ensure that the aid gets to the people we mean to help and does not merely serve to prop up this or that repressive regime of whatever ideological coloring? Could we make such aid contingent on an equal reduction in the recipient country's production and importation of arms?

That, I submit, is the homework we in the peace movement need to do if we want to be taken seriously and to have a real impact on policy.

Yes, I am advocating that we think and plan "as if." As if the Cold War were over. As if we had more pressing concerns than the relative number and throw-weight of our and the Russians' ICBMs. As if the human race had more important decisions to make than whether to commit itself to the free-enterprise or centrally planned organization of production. As if we wanted our beautiful planet to survive.

I advocate it because, like the authors of *Beyond the Freeze*, I believe that it is the attractiveness of just such a plan that will convince both us and the Soviets of the need to halt the arms race. Imagine our next president going to his Soviet vis-a-vis and saying to him, "Look, here is our blueprint for peace. Here is how we want to

spend our resources. There is no threat in this to you. How can you help us? How can we help you? How can we both help humankind?"

Perhaps I am a dreamer, but I suspect the response might surprise Mr. Reagan!

□ 2120

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS], who has taken the lead in this kind of project, and I am happy to be a cosponsor of his bill.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I simply want to compliment him on a very important statement and a very important introduction of his legislation. As the gentleman knows, we witness in this chamber year in and year out the arms race and the defense budget sort of driving everything that goes on in the Congress and in the country. We witness time after time Members being persuaded to vote for legislation which they may not have voted for because they suspected they were not doing the best thing for the country, but they were sort of job-nailed into voting for it because the alternative was to suffer job loss in their districts.

So I think the gentleman's proposal and the gentleman's commitment over the years is extremely important. What is significant also is that this is not a first-time entry by the gentleman. He not only talks about vision for the future, he votes day in and day out to help us come closer to achieving that vision. I want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING].

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate the work he has done in this field, which has been monumental indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. LUNGREN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House from August 1 or 2 to September 4, 1985, and a conditional adjournment of

the Senate from August 1 or 2 to September 4 or 9, 1985; and

H. Con. Res. 181. Concurrent resolution to correct the enrollment of the bill H.R. 2068.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 276 of title 22 of the United States Code, as amended, the Vice President appoints Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. ZORINSKY as members of the Senate delegation to the Interparliamentary Union Conference to be held in Ottawa, Canada, on September 2-7, 1985.

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, at this hour and after having approved the resolution that will bring us into recess until the days immediately following Labor Day, it is well to ponder on just where we are out in the real world. We just voted—that is, the majority voted—for the approval of a budget resolution that from the very beginning, as well as the President's budget proposal, as well as the Senate majority budget proposal, from the very outset are predicated on a fundamental misperception and erroneous predicate.

I pointed this out during the time that we had the first debates on the budget resolution for this year. It is well to point out that for 3 years we have not had a budget resolution in compliance with the 1974 Budget Reform Act, I was 1 of 10 that did not vote for it.

Now, my advice on this evening for the privileged orders as I have been since almost the outset of this Congress, this first session of the Congress—because I think we are living in similar times in which perforce we must face the fundamental basic issues that all through our history from the very inception of our nationhood we had to face: the basic question of whether the people or a privileged elite would be making the key decisions that would determine the economic, the fiscal, the monetary well-being of that particular people.

This was the issue that confronted our country when it was just beginning to shape itself into nationhood, when you had an amorphous, a rather not quite yet shaped union, and in that beginning struggle these great leaders and this great people were confronted with these basic issues, but they had to make decisions in the context of a population—in the 13 Colonies anyway—of just barely some 3 million in a very definitely agricultur-

al type of society. But the issues have been the same all through mankind's history and societal experience when it comes to the basic forces at work within a beginning structured community.

In our case the first issue arose when the Continental Congresses were first organized in order to try to seek some consolidation of position, of outlook, that would unite them as a common thread in this very beginning of the 13 Colonies as a Nation. That issue was, as it has been all along: what would be the banker, the financial agency, for this group or, at that beginning period, aggregation? In the Congresses charters were issued to private individuals to form the Bank of North America, at that time in Philadelphia. Afterwards and during the Confederacy, that is, during the period of the Articles of Confederation, which soon dissolved, and with the calling of the Constitutional Convention, a firm resolve was made by those leaders, enlightened, cultured, and very conscious of the fact that they were fighting for freedom in its very rawest definition—freedom from what has been called by the historians a mercantile system.

We have got to think in terms of trying to consider what we have done today. We are a great multiple Nation, a pluralistic country, a vast country of 230-some million inhabitants, with first place power now in the world's structure, but under attack as to its ability to uphold what the political scientists call its hegemony, its power, its influence, over those areas throughout the globe that, as a result of two great convulsions known as World War I and World War II, have resulted in the United States inescapably having to confront destiny.

But we have heard the debates, like the discussion we had this evening with respect to this last-minute reconciliation between the Senate and the House and apparently with some kind of understanding from the President on what would be and what would not be acceptable as a net budgetary target or figure. But, as I say, when the captain and the kings have departed for the August recess, the fact of the matter is that they have departed into a future that is illusory, and the very basis upon which we agreed on a so-called budget resolution is at best tenuous and in reality unsupportable, the reason being the reality of the existence of the problems confronting us, every one of which has not been confronted basically, beginning with the overall perception of the world as it is today in the 1980's, not as we would have it be, not with the mindset of our President and, I presume, the majority in this House after hearing these debates, a Europe, a 1947 Europe.

I believe that one of the basic premises that we must consider is that, unlike World War I, World War II has not terminated. Just recently we have had some newspaper discussion about something called the Helsinki agreements of about 10 years ago. That was the first effort made in the so-called postwar period to try to reach some kind of a basis upon which could be projected an eventual peace treaty. But the basic issue, the issue at the heart of the matter, as much as it was after World War I, is still with us after World War II, or during this sequella period after what most people consider to be World War II.

□ 2130

We have failed to differentiate between the hot shooting phase of a war and the relative inert period, but which still is in an environment of battle, of warfare, of conflict, of friction. Our economy reflects it. We are now an economy that is completely taken over on the basis of a garrison state, of a military type of endeavor and framework of reference.

Now, the steps by which this point has been reached have been gradual. As we look back in retrospect, we can see that it has been cumulative, but that was not the world and it was not the mind set of the leaders in and out of the United States in the 1940's, after 1945, in the 1950's with the beginning of the setting and the jelling of the so-called cold war.

Well, cold war was one way of expressing the fact that the hot shooting phase of the conflict had ended, but there was still some kind of conflict ongoing. In between, we had been involved in war and we have been challenged to confront the basic issue, which is a prime constitutional issue, one that brings forth in history the fact that it was an issue most bitterly debated, most hotly talked about and contested during the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, and that was where the exclusive power to declare war was deposited.

There was no question about it, when we see in article I and right before section 8 in clause 7, the fact that that power to declare was exclusively mandated to the Congress. There are no ifs, ands and buts. In fact, it is just a simple terse statement of fact in the enumerated, the panoply of enumeration of powers granted by the Constitution to the Congress in article I. For good reason article I is the article that has to do with the Congress or the representative branch or the policymaking body of the Nation.

In article II, the executive branch, where for the first time such an office as we call the Presidency was considered, and that also took great debate. In the first 10 years of our national

existence, in the Continental Congresses, in the Articles of Confederation, they could not even think they wanted anything like the Presidency. There was no such comparable office. They feared it. They distrusted it. These were imminent minds. These were minds that knew at long last mankind in a new world would envision a new order, a new order of liberty, a new order in which God-given endowments and talents to the individual and his personality could flower to the fullest under an environment of total freedom, unrestrained by kings governing in the name of divine power.

So in the first sentence of the preface of the Constitution, right in the preamble, the whole thing is encompassed in those seven words, "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union"—and so on. It did not say, "We, the Congress," or "I, the President." It said, "We, the people."

The people are the sovereign power. All power emanates from them, but you would not think so nowadays. Whenever we start talking about that, let us really remember that. Let us really remember every day, every minute, every hour, that we are merely agents of the people, that we have a grant of a trust only. We are not masters and we should not even try to think that way. It is the only place in the world where that basic concept is actually not only preached, but governs a nation.

We are confronted before the 200th anniversary of that Constitution, that is, of the real birth of our form of government, with the issue of whether or not we in our time redeem ourselves and reaffirm or whether or not we continue to succumb to this loss of faith, where we have entered into a period of twilight wars, Presidential wars, if you please, where Presidents whether they have or have not been directly or indirectly, through a delegation of constitutional power from the Congress or not, engaging the country in wars.

This President has done so. In the course of doing so, he has violated solemn treaties that at least for the foreseeable future have jeopardized our ability to lead morally and collectively those nations with whom we must share the future.

Destiny has said these are the nations of the new world. Not one in the Western Hemisphere shares our policies with respect to what this administration has done and continues to do; yet we budget and we appropriate and we hear great talk about how we are going to reduce the deficit, but the President himself even in sending over his version of the budget said quite candidly that it would not result in anything but for the next 3 fiscal years a built-in deficit of not less than \$200 billion.

But why, why should that be? Then why tell the American people that we must have a constitutional amendment to balance the budget?

Just what point have we reached in our national destiny where we can with great glee conclude a session on the eve of momentous occurrences? Have we forgotten that just less than a month ago our Nation was in the throes of an agonizing dilemma, an ordeal with the hijacking of the airplane with those Americans? Have we forgotten as we trot off and enjoy some kind of rest perhaps for the majority or some trips throughout the world or just simply go back to our districts to have a chance to forget about this for a while, that there are seven Americans held captive in Lebanon alone? Was there no thought given to that as we depart?

Should we not be knowing for sure that while we are away lulled in a recess, there will be decisions that continue to be taken as a result of action or nonaction, budgetarily or appropriation-wise, in Central America?

What will be our reaction while we are gone—and I pray to the Lord that I am dead wrong—if we have a disastrous occurrence in which some of our servicemen are killed in Central America? What will be the reaction? What will be the request of the President? This has been overlooked. The Congress has refused to consider these facts.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the gentleman mentioning those seven hostages in Lebanon. I know they are always on his mind, as they are on mine.

Has the gentleman been able to come up with a concrete proposal to the President—I have really not—on what he could do to put maximum pressure upon the State of Lebanon, which really is in chaos and has no specific government, or the State of Syria, which has a very specific government under the leadership of President Assad; what does the gentleman think we could do to bring pressure during this break while we are enjoying the wonderful educational process of travel or enjoying our beautiful 435 districts in this country, in Hawaii and Alaska and all the other legislative designated areas, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and so forth, Puerto Rico, beautiful vacation lands?

Mr. GONZALEZ. And San Antonio, TX.

Mr. DORNAN of California. San Antonio, a beautiful district where I went through preflight training and did more pushups than I have ever done in my life or since in only a 3-month period—what are we going to do?

What does the gentleman think the President can do to keep the world aware of these seven fine Americans that are in terrorist captivity?

□ 2140

Mr. GONZALEZ. If the gentleman will allow me, I have pondered that. I did when the President was Jimmy Carter and we had the Iranian captivity. And I pondered a long time.

As a great admirer and worshipper of the Constitution that governs us, I saw in that article I, section 8, clause 10, the anticipation on the part of those who voted that such things would continue to happen as had happened on the high seas, piracy, and a specific phrase that is in the Constitution in clause 10 about punishing, defining, and punishing the violations of the laws of nations, which I felt was a terrible, gross violation in the case of the Iranian capture of our Embassy officials and employees because that captivity, that type of hostage-taking had not occurred since the Crusades. It just had not happened.

You know, when our wars have broken out, like the first war, and then with Hitler, our Ambassadors in Berlin were taken in and placed in a hotel. We took theirs and put them in a hotel.

Mr. DORNAN of California. We sent them up to the Greenbrier in West Virginia. We had a nice soft, diplomatic word "interred."

Mr. GONZALEZ. That is right. But as soon as possible, they were allowed to go back to their land, and ours were allowed to come back.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Even under Adolf Hitler and the Tojo war lords,

Mr. GONZALEZ. That is right. That is right.

But in the case of Iran, this was absolutely something new, both internally and domestically where you have a theological, you have a religious government. It was a throwback in a way to the 11th century. And you had a hard thing to deal with.

I felt that the Constitution was telling us, hey, Congress, you have this power to define the offense, and punish for it, because right following that it says you will be and are hereby granted the power to give and issue letters of marque and reprisal.

So I wrote President Carter and I suggested two things, or three things really. One, that we should proceed through what we had then constituted, as we now have it, the United Nations. And sure enough, the United Nations, even Russia joined in condemning the Iranian action. But there is no power to enforce.

I suggested the second thing, and that was that more immediately would be to impound the assets within our reach, which were considerable. I used

to be chairman of the Subcommittee on International Finance, and I estimated that that amounted to about \$11 billion. And if the banker in Iran hollered, as the President says, uncle, they would release those hostages or they would find some accommodation.

Well, that was not done. I had no immediate reaction to my letter. I had a short sort of an indirect response.

But then I alluded to the fact that the Congress had a responsibility under that article I, section 8, clause 10, and I introduced a resolution in which I said it is the sense of the Congress that under this section we shall, and perhaps through the executive branch, if necessary, issue letters of marque and reprisal.

Now in this case, I think that is really far more appropriate than the other two. As you say, this is no well-defined political entity of a State. You have a diffused, as you have had for years, hundreds of years, in what we call Lebanon now, so you do have that, you have that impossibility of affixing responsibility to any given scheme of government. But you do have little fiefdoms and little groups and apparently some of these are more or less, properly or improperly, attributed to the responsibility of having taken and still holding the seven American hostages.

Mr. DORNAN of California. There was a story in the Washington Post, if I may interrupt the gentleman, that it may be even one family, a large extended family, the Masawu family.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I saw that. I believe that it is very possible. I think it is very feasible.

I do not think we ought to throw the whole weight of the responsibility on the President. I believe we do have a responsibility that we can discharge.

So I have introduced, I formulated and introduced a resolution to that respect invoking in the name of the Congress article I, section 1, clause 10.

Mr. DORNAN of California. I think that is an excellent suggestion.

May I submit for you to ponder, and then I will let you get back to your excellent special order, and for the American citizens who may be with us still in the gallery, or what I call our extended gallery throughout the country; that is, thanks to the magic of cable television, to ponder if the direct action that Teddy Roosevelt recommended in 1904 when a Moroccan, although it was not the nation of Morocco then, a man by the name of Rosolo took an American, Petrocari, prisoner, and Roosevelt recommended in one simple sentence "Petrocari alive or Rosolo dead."

If the American Sixth Fleet was to pull up along the coast of Levant, the eastern Mediterranean, and seal off all access to the sea for both Syria and Lebanon and announce to the world that we thought we had the legal

backing to sit there until either government, the confused situation in Lebanon or the government in Syria, either government leaned on this Masawu family to turn over our innocent Americans, including two religious people, and that at least would be direct action. I happen to be of the opinion that it would probably work, and I just submit that to the gentleman for his analysis.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to express my appreciation to the gentleman from California. I think that he and I are basically in agreement that this is an issue that we cannot quite overlook. We should not forget, certainly, and sometimes I believe timing, and in this case, of course, the judgment of the Commander in Chief and the President would be something that I guess we would have to defer to. In my humble opinion, at this point I think that with the diffusion of these centers of local power that perhaps a massive assault, or even a massive blockage would result only in the overuse, it may be an overstrained or an overcharged type of attack.

I would prefer an up-to-date, 20th-century version of a letters of marque and reprisal in which we could find ways and means to accomplish the same purpose. But instead of a sort of a shotgun approach, we use a 30-30 approach and single out and punish the culprits.

Obviously, whatever form or vestige of organized government exists has not had the power to control the depredations, the piracies that have occurred, but even that is just a symptom of what I think the more fundamental issue is that we must resolve, both domestically as well as in confronting these powerful international forces now that impinge upon us domestically.

For example, Lebanon, we must never forget our policy or lack of policy in Lebanon has been very ill-defined since 1970 when the British pulled out after they and the Russians had installed the Shah of Iran. In 1970, and I made allusion to this last week, the so-called Nixon doctrine was that we would rely on client states, the Saudis, and the Iranians, to look after our interests in the gulf there.

□ 2150

I have always believed that if you have a business, any businessman will tell you you cannot delegate it. You have got to tend to your business. You keep your business, you keep it up, and it will keep you.

When we start getting client states, we become sort of the puppets and creatures and victims of those very client states that we think in our hubris, in are arrogance, that we actually are controlling. I think that also we have to have a review, a review of

just what the facts are. The budget which was debated and the great opposition that I heard here this evening was to the point that it had an inordinate share of for defense or military or whatever you want to call it. I find that my quarrel with it is not so much the allocation of the funds but as to the overall emphasis on a proper and certainly invulnerable system of defense. But if we are going to think in terms of defense it is one thing. If we are going to think in terms of aggression, war, then we have to call the budget a war budget.

That is what I called it when the President, in an incremental, almost an exponential manner in the last 4 years has asked for that. But I quarrel with the allocation and the apportionment and the perversity of the priorities. The reason I quarrel is, as I have brought out here, when the President is saying that he has to get \$20 billion for something that may never be developed, it may never be deployed, and I am not even speaking about star wars, and I am going back not to this President but to one of his predecessors, to his predecessor President Carter and the case of the MX where the military themselves have been in great conflict of opinion and where the very debates I have listened to here in a passionate way have shifted around so much that they have ended up in the very situation that was being contradicted to begin with.

Now when we say that we are going to demand an allocation of \$20 billion, but the Secretary of Defense tells me, like he did last year and the year before, that is the Secretary of the Air Force, that the Air Force did not have and does not have the sufficient budget to give air pilot training time to our Air Force pilots, certainly there is something wrong with that priority because we may never deploy, we may never even construct a system of the MX. We may never even reach the stage where we can place into reality even a sort of prototype system of what has been known as the star wars, as it is popularly known. But we do know that we have men and women whose morale must be there, we must have a country that is worth defending. If in the meanwhile our infrastructure, which is a fancy word given by professors to the vitals of a community, its road system, bridges, sewage system without which you have no modern community, all of those are crumbling down around our ears throughout the country. The same President that is asking me, and I am certainly defense oriented, in fact I was attacked for being too defense oriented. I have been attacked always. I have been attacked as a hawk, I have been attacked as a dove. Yet I look at the source of the attack and realize

that it is predicated on an ignorance of the total role.

My utterances are all in the record. It is nothing that I have said now as compared to what I said 15 years ago. I am saying essentially the same thing.

What I am saying is that with the perversity in the priorities, with the abdication of our basic responsibility to go to the bottom of things whether it is our domestic needs, community development needs or our rural needs, and when the President comes to me and he says "80 percent of the thrust of the programs that I'm going to cut are going to be in the area which your subcommittee has jurisdiction over," that bothers me. What is that? Housing, both community development, rural as well as urban. Now as chairman of that subcommittee, and that is the largest subcommittee in the whole Congress; I have been privileged in the last 4 years to go into over 30 States as chairman.

I have been into every single agriculture-producing area of this country, whether the Eastern Shore which is just 1 hour and 15 minutes from here or elsewhere. I can take you to a situation where I saw labor camp situations that are atrocious. We just cannot reconcile them with America. They are just as bad, if not worse than some of the situations in the undeveloped Third World countries, so called.

Now that is just 1 hour and 15 minutes from the Nation's Capital. These are invisible people. It is the same thing elsewhere; I have been to southeast Bronx, I have been to east Brooklyn, I have been to Philadelphia. In fact, I was scheduled to take the subcommittee to the very area where the police in Philadelphia bombed and burned up entire neighborhoods, killing children, women, men. Now this is in America, in the United States, while we spend elsewhere.

He says we have to cut all of the housing programs; this is the President's recommendation.

In this budget which I cannot support—I cannot support what the so-called glorious compromise was: Look, we are not going to kill the programs, we are just going to compromise with the Senate and just barely, maybe, keep them a little bit alive.

But the country is not a stagnated country. Our country is a dynamic country, a growing country. That is why they started all this jazz about freeze. I said, "You don't freeze living material, you don't freeze living matter. The only thing you freeze is inert matter." Our country is bursting, it is dynamic, it wants outlets for growth and production. It does not want to see the fruits of its labor and its produce stolen through a system of international currency that is going to eventually relegate our workers to peonage. They have placed in competition with every peon and coolie of the

world because they have been sold out, as I have been saying for 15 years, on and off of this floor.

These are the issues that we ought to be confronting so that we can face the Communists somewhere and say, "Sure, we are against communism, but who dares take on the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board?" Who in the meanwhile, leading this army of voracious, voracious elements, the ones that Jefferson reviled against and also Andrew Jackson. Why did he kill the chartering of national banks in 1837, the Second U.S. Bank? Why did Lincoln the day he was killed and the week he was killed have uppermost in his mind what was happening in that area? Well, that was the year they passed the 1864 Currency Act, the 1865 National Bank Act and he foresaw and he said and he worried about it and he spoke about it.

□ 2200

Then you had the recurring panics and depressions of 1892 and 1893; 1908. That gave rise to the Congress, after a lot of hearings and the Peugot committee in the House of Representatives, they finally struck off the Federal Reserve Board system.

Today, I am absolutely depressed when my fellow Congressmen say, well, you do not want to interfere with the freedom and the independence of the Federal Reserve Board. You mean we are going to let this groups of unaccountable panjandrums, who are the hirelings of the dollar barons in our country? Who have sold us out?

Why, these same banks have speculated against the American dollar every day they could for the last 10, 12 years, since Richard Nixon took us off of the so-called gold exchange and devalued the dollar; went into the so-called floating rate of exchange, which meant that the American businessman—today, anybody trying to get what they call a consumer loan from a bank will not pay less than 17 percent interest. This is what is killing us. This is what is doing us in.

The budget we passed today, that is a bubble, just a bubble. We floated it up; it is going to burst just like the others, because they are predicated on the wrong and erroneous quality.

The other thing is, the President, for whatever reason has embarked on stimulating, fostering a spirit—in fact, I call it a psychosis of war toward Russia.

Well, George Washington warned us—he said, and I am going to quote exactly:

The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its beauty and its interest.

Pick up the paper of last week, and you will see that the President entered

into some kind of a treaty with the Chinese Communist regime, if you please. They are bold about it; make no bones. We do not know the details of that; nobody has bothered, in the Congress, to try to find out.

He entered into a secret deal. Part of it was that the Chinese Communists were supposed to buy 6 million metric tons of our wheat and grain. They reneged on that deal last year; that is why we had the farm crisis we were all reading about late last year.

But the reason was the Communist Chinese reneged on the deal. Yet, with great pomp and ceremony just last week, he had the Chinese President in the deal, the ramifications of which I do not know and I do not know of anybody else in the Congress that does.

I believe that these are the things that are making a joke of our actions and our activities and our debates and our talk.

The other notice last week was that the State of Israel was—the Ambassadors of Israel and Russia were meeting in Paris; and they were talking about some kind of a reconciliation.

Russia broke off diplomatic relations with Israel during the 1973—I believe that was the Yom Kippur war.

Now, one good thing is that if there is some reconciliation there, the United States undoubtedly will benefit by some kind a conciliatory move toward Russia.

Now, if we insist, however, as the President has continued to, in making the smallest country in the Western Hemisphere the scene of an East-West confrontation, making us the laughing stock of the world, any knowledgeable citizen throughout the world just laughs when General Haig says: "We are drawing the line in El Salvador, right here."

Four years later, and after \$4 billion, we are nowhere near. Why? Because it is predicated on a misperception. There is no such thing as an East-West confrontation in these impoverished nations.

What is happening? It is very simple to see. It does not take an expert. You have these masses, well, now they exceed us in population by some 80 to 90 million, for the first time I guess about 15 to 20 years ago they exceeded our total population. It is another world there. They have taken oppression; their own oppressive, tyrannical master rulers have looked down upon them, treated them like dogs, killed them off like they did in El Salvador in the 1932 uprising—that was taken care of then.

Our interests; we are identified—you go to those countries and you will realize what a tremendous awe and power there is in Los Estados Unidos el Norte; the United States of the North, because the United States of the North, for instance, in Honduras, is

United Fruit. In Chile, Anaconda Copper, and the like.

So they are indistinguishable; our Government and those entities.

I think the time has come when we have got to read a little bit of that history. We have got to take time out for the sake of our children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren; because the way we are going, we are growing no wiser, no better, no more civilized than the misdirected nations in Europe where you have these ancient rivalries and hatreds still boiling over, even after the war.

As a matter of fact, the great passion in some of the West German provinces or states is the Silesian refugee saying, "We've got to get Silesia back from Poland." And what is Minister Cole telling them? He is saying, well, now, wait a while, do not overcharge here; wait until we have a peace treaty.

Well, who here in this Congress has even conceived of the fact that anybody in Europe is talking about a peace treaty and defining those issues that even though they look as if they are buried, are percolating and churning and boiling underneath the surface?

That is what the President found out when he tried to get a joinder of West Europe, in trying to embargo the construction of the gas pipeline from Siberia into Western Europe. He soon found out that that pipeline, its management headquarters was over in the Ruhr; they call it Ruhr Gas. And the principal stockholders are Exxon and Mobil and the British Oil, and behind those entities are the Chase Manhattan Bank, the First City National—these are now tremendous multi-transnational entities. They can thumb their nose at any sovereign government.

In our case, we have been victimized, because once we have gone into this unsettled business of these vast exchanges, what they call the international currency exchange, which is now what? It is a speculative market. You have speculators speculating there like you do in the commodity exchanges in Chicago, and you have these very same banks, some of them trying to dodge taxes in Europe—and certainly taxes in the United States—so who talks about what I call the Latin dollar market, where not only in the Bahamas but in Panama we have this escaped capital now up in the hundred billion dollar range.

Well, every day—there is no such things as offices for this international market; you have these agents or hired hands of the banks at their computer 24 hours a day. Every day you have mass movements of over \$75, \$80 billion of this, and every one of that has an implication for our banking system, domestic banking system in the United States.

We are beginning, and we should have known, that if we had certain factors that were well-established since 20 years ago, 1965, some of us spoke out then, that we would have to anticipate, that we would have to try to do something.

I have not gotten up on this House floor to criticize or point my finger without having a corresponding suggestion, and I am delighted the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] rose a while ago, because it gave me a chance to report on what, humbly, but very solitarily I have been trying to offer as thoughts, as resources.

Obviously, in reading the history and the contents of the Constitution, were in anticipation of such things as these.

□ 2210

We cannot afford that. No nation can. And how best to prepare I think is to soberly sit down and think, not to react out of emotion. Whether it is humility or humiliation, I believe our nation in its greatness can confront. What I am saying is that those of us serving in this great, vast body, are privileged class, and I am offering my advice to the privileged classes of America. As I said, my hero and the fellow I followed in this example was the famous Joel Barlow, the revolutionary poet. He was one of the ministers who served Washington's Revolutionary Army. But he was also a revolutionist and a great pamphleteer. He was a great friend of Tom Paine. He addressed such a message to the privileged orders of Europe. In my case, I am offering my messages with specific suggestions. All I have ever asked, as I have presented resolutions, is that they be duly considered by the committees that are set up for the purpose. I never have done anything frivolous. I think too much of this body and I have too much self respect in my membership of this body and how privileged a position it is to ever in frivolity offer anything. I do believe, though, most sincerely, like Shakespeare said, when we become arrogant, complacent, "but when we in our viciousness grow hard, Oh, misery on't! The wise gods seal our eyes. In our own filth drops our clear judgments. Make us adore our errors. Laugh at us while we strut to our confusion."

I appeal to my colleagues when we reunify, God willing, September 4, we pick up where we left off, realize that the real chore, no matter how politically feasible it is to explain and say we did something about the deficit, something about the budget, we have got to face the reality, for only we will be strutting to our own confusion if we do not.

PROPOSED PRISON CONSTRUCTION IN URBAN AREAS

(Mr. STOKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, recently, it has come to my attention that the mayor of Milwaukee, WI, and the Governor of the State have been embroiled in a 3-year dispute about a proposed \$50.5 million prison in downtown Milwaukee.

Questions concerning the desirability and feasibility of building a prison in urban and residential areas are at the center of this particular controversy. This issue is not only controversial in Milwaukee but also in other areas around the Nation including my congressional district in Cleveland where State officials are planning to build a 500-bed medium security facility in a residential neighborhood.

Mr. Speaker, as State prison officials attempt to alleviate overcrowding in prison facilities by building new ones, more cities will be confronted with the tough prospect of having prisons built well inside city limits and possibly in residential areas.

While some prison reformers suggest that such a movement might increase the accessibility of family members to inmates, there has not been very much recent research on the overall impact of this proposal.

Specifically, there are few up-to-date studies which examine the impact of prisons in cities and residential areas on property value and security. Furthermore, to my knowledge, there also has been no substantial research exploring the balance between the number of new job opportunities which a prison facility brings with the decline in property values and opportunity for new residential development and construction.

In the Collinwood section of Cleveland, the State of Ohio plans to build a prison in the heart of a residential area. Within a 3-block radius of the proposed site on Coit Road, there are 626 housing units with 1,750 residents.

For the last several months, the proposed prison has been the source of great public debate in the Cleveland area with many area residents strongly opposing the construction of the prison.

Mr. Speaker, the debates in Milwaukee and Cleveland are indicative of the situation many urban centers may be faced with in the future. As a means of beginning the discussion in the Congress about this issue, I would like to insert in the RECORD newspaper articles on the proposed prison facility on Coit Road in Cleveland.

RESIDENTS WANT PRISON ELSEWHERE

(By Dave Rowe)

Put that thing someplace else.

That was the unmistakable theme as nearly 150 residents of the E. 140th Street and Coit Road neighborhood loudly applauded council's passage of a resolution opposing the state's plan to build a prison on the site of the old Fisher Body-Coit Road plant.

The resolution, passed unanimously, declares council's official objection to converting the old plant into a 500-bed medium security prison, largely due to "widespread community opposition."

Ward 10 Councilman Larry Jones, sponsor of the legislation, told council prior to the vote that in addition to worries about safety and housing values, his constituents also were concerned about being deprived of some of their constitutional rights.

"These are the people that pay the taxes, and pay the bills," he said, referring to the crowd in council chambers and an anti-prison crowd of more than 500 which attended a February hearing in Ward 10 conducted by the Ohio Department of Corrections. "It is unfair to impose a prison on my constituents against their wills."

Past potential sites for a "Northeast Ohio Reformatory"—originally intended to be a 1,250-bed facility located somewhere within Cuyahoga County—included Valley View and the E. 55th-Broadway area, causing Jones to say, "There, the communities got together and said, 'No.' We're basically saying the same thing."

The Coit Road area residents, many of whom stood outside with picket signs prior to the meeting, cheered loudest when Jones directly addressed Mayor George Voinovich.

"Mayor, it is unfair of you to support the prison against the will of the people," Jones said. "We're prepared to fight this issue all the way, but if the prison is built, we would not forget those individuals who allowed this to happen."

Voinovich, who along with Council President George Forbes, Gov. Richard Celeste, State Sen. Mike White (D-21) and State Rep. Ike Thompson (D-14) supports the concept of a Coit Road prison, gave no immediate response. After the meeting, he told reporters, "In the long run, I think a prison would improve the area—frankly, the safety of that area would be improved."

White, not present at the meeting but perhaps the loudest proponent of the Coit Road plan, has argued that demolition of the old auto plant and construction of the facility for mostly young, first-time offenders would mean an immediate \$30 million in construction salaries, as well as more than 200 permanent jobs. He also has argued that the 49-acre Coit Road site is not suitable for any other type of development, saying, "I wish I had a Saturn plant to put in there, but I don't."

Jones, whose position is supported by Cong. Louis Stokes (D-21), argued Monday night that the site could be developed by private industry. "Instead of 200 jobs, we could be talking about 2,000 jobs," Jones said.

The decision, to come after a 13-member task force presently studying the issue delivers its recommendation, will be made by the department of corrections in conjunction with the area's elected representatives. The task force, composed of individuals selected by the elected officials and including planning director Hunter Morrison and director of economic development Gary Conley, has been told to deliver its report by May 10.

"We will not abide by their (the task force's) recommendation," Jones said Monday night. "This is a task force we have here tonight."

Besides a "task force" of angry residents, Jones also has been promised further support from some of his council colleagues.

"Instead of catching criminals, the state wants to put them into our neighborhoods as permanent residents," Ward 12 Councilman Dennis Kucinich said in vowing to work against the state's plan. "This involves the principle of local control—the right of the people to determine the future of their neighborhood."

Along similar lines, Ward 11 Councilman Michael Polensek said, "If we go and disregard their (residents') will, then we do not have a democratic body or a democratic system."

Jones, whose resolution passed through council's committee system intact and virtually unopposed, said it should have some impact on what finally happens.

"The whole city council is sending a message to the governor and the other officials telling them to choose another location," he said. "At least, I'm hoping it will have some effect on some of the advisory committee members."

Polensek, though, said it still is possible that the state will proceed with the projects in spite of the resolution. "If the state decides to go ahead and ram this down people's throats, it's be an uphill battle," he said.

[From the Plain Dealer, May 19, 1985]

PANEL PICKS COIT ROAD FOR PRISON—CLOSE VOTE, MINORITY REPORT KEEP DISSENSION ON SITE ALIVE

(By Harry Stainer)

A citizens advisory council recommended by a 5-4 vote yesterday that the state build a 500-bed reformatory on the site of the old Fisher Body plant at Coit Rd. and E. 140th St.

The proposal to build a state prison in Cleveland has been turned down at several other sites in the city since 1982. The delay in building it resulted in the size being reduced from the original \$76 million and 1,250 beds to \$35 million and 500 beds.

The chairman of the advisory council, the Rev. James G. Hannah, pastor of Central Christian Church, 697 E. 105th St., released copies of the majority report at a news conference at his church. Among those attending was State Sen. Michael White, D-21, of Cleveland, who has supported construction of a prison here.

A few hours later at a conference in the Bar Stop Co., a small business in the plant at 13227 Coit, the four members in the minority released their report opposing construction. Among those present were Councilman Larry A. Jones, D-10, and a representative of Rep. Louis Stokes, D-21, of Warrensville Heights, both of whom oppose the proposed site.

White said the group had agreed to abide by the majority decision and it was disquieting that the minority was holding a news conference.

Jones said that the agreement was to participate in the group and that he was speaking for the people in his ward who overwhelmingly opposed the Coit site.

Hannah, who as chairman did not vote on the issue, said that if there had been a tie, he would have voted to build the prison on Coit Rd. He was appointed to the group by the state.

Two members of the 13-member advisory council represented Mayor George V. Voinovich (a supporter of the site), but were not allowed to vote. The reason, Hannah said, was that the mayor's delegates did not

attend the meetings or go on field trips. The group adopted a rule that the right to decide the issue should be given to those who attended at least three meetings, Hannah added.

The advisory council was to be the answer to delays on a decision to build a medium-security prison in Cleveland. Richard P. Seiter, director of the state Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, officially appointed the members, but elected officials submitted two names each for appointment.

Split votes appeared to indicate how difficult the decision was White, who favors the construction, saw his two voices on the council split, one for and one against. Stokes, who is against construction, saw his nominees split, one against and one abstaining.

Council President George L. Forbes' representatives both voted for construction. (City Council passed a resolution against the project, but Forbes, D-9, is a supporter.) Jones' people both voted against the project. And those named by State Rep. Ike Thompson, D-14, of Cleveland, voted for the project.

The majority voted for the prison, Hannah said, because construction would mean jobs, encourage economic development and clean up a neighborhood eyesore. Others pointed out that a local state prison would make visits easier.

The report recommended that 60% of the 215 people expected to be employed by the reformatory should be residents of Glenville-Collinwood, and that the state buy the 15 homes with backyards facing the site and use as many minority contractors as possible.

The report called for a permanent advisory committee that would be notified if more than 500 inmates were housed.

The minority report, said member Anthony Ray, concluded that despite discussion and trips to Grafton and Dayton, no evidence was submitted to support the theory that a prison could be put in a densely populated urban neighborhood.

The minority report said the 50-acre site was not large enough for a 500-bed prison, that it would create fear in the neighborhood and that the prison cells were designed for two beds, which indicates a future prison size of 1,000 beds.

Grafton, in Lorain County, would be a better choice, said the minority report, because of its space, and would be close to Cleveland for visitors.

The minority report said the wishes of only the people of Ward 10 were being ignored. Earlier proposals to build the prison in the Broadway and Valley View communities were dropped when residents protested.

The abstention came from Carl Anderson, who said he did not like the way Hannah directed the council activities.

[From the Plain Dealer, May 31, 1985]

COIT ROAD CHOSEN AS PRISON SITE

(By Joseph D. Rice)

COLUMBUS.—A 31-month search for a site for a medium-security prison in Cuyahoga County ended yesterday.

The 500-bed reformatory will be built on the site of the old General Motors Corp. Fisher Body plant at E. 140th St., and Coit Rd. in Collinwood, Richard P. Seiter, director of the state Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections, announced.

The facility will take a year to design and two more to build, said department spokesman Robert Prosser. It will house men

under age 30 who are in prison for the first time, Prosser said.

Cleveland architects Richard L. Bowen and Thomas Zung will design the reformatory, which probably will have four to eight buildings, Prosser said.

Prosser said Seiter assured the Rev. James Hannah, chairman of a citizens advisory committee that recommended the site, that the state would take "deliberate efforts" to involve minority contractors in the construction.

The facility will cost an estimated \$39 million.

State Sen. Michael R. White, D-21, of Cleveland, said a permanent citizens committee would be formed soon to work with state officials on the prison.

"It will be involved in everything from the landscaping and the construction to any problems that may arise from integrating the facility into the community," White said.

White said the state agreed to give preference to area residents in hiring the 215 guards, clerks, teachers, social workers and others who will work at the reformatory. The annual payroll is estimated at \$3.0 million.

Rep. Louis Stokes, D-21, of Warrensville Heights, who led the fight against the Coit Rd. proposal, said yesterday he would "continue to oppose this demeaning act by the governor. . . ." He and Councilman Larry A. Jones, D-10, planned a rally against the plan at 7:30 p.m. Thursday in New Calvary Baptist Church, 722 E. 150th St.

"In his decision to place a prison in the 21st District . . . against the wishes of the residents and property owners of the Coit Rd. area, Gov. (Richard F.) Celeste has once again displayed his disrespect and disdain for the people in the 21st District," Stokes said.

"I have not given up the idea that there will not be a prison," said Jones, whose ward includes the site.

Mayor George V. Voinovich, in Washington yesterday to be briefed on President Reagan's tax proposal, said he had not been opposed to the Coit Rd. site.

"In the long run, it will provide jobs and . . . ultimately an improvement in the area," he said.

"I sympathize with the people who live in the area. As the mayor, I've got to look at the big picture. I can understand their opposition, but in the long run things often work out correctly.

Voinovich and other city officials had been lobbying to have the facility in Cleveland since the correction department announced in November 1982 that it had scrapped the site of the old Standard Oil Co. (Ohio) refinery in the Flats because of chemical contamination.

Considered in the ensuing search were an adjacent site at 2929 Broadway and sites at E. 40th St. and Woodland Ave.; W. 130th St. and Bellaire Rd.; Canal and Rockside roads in Valley View; and city-owned land in Warrensville Township.

In each case, the state met community opposition or found the site was too small, its terrain unsuitable or other problems.

A minimum of 50 acres was needed. The Coit Rd. site is about 50 acres.

"This (Coit Rd.) was the only available site in Cuyahoga County that could meet the design criteria," Prosser said.

The state had originally planned to build a 1,250-bed reformatory in Cleveland. Officials decided to put 750 of the beds in Graton in Lorain County, where a 500-bed re-

formatory had been planned, when it could not find a suitable site here. Graton already has an honor farm.

Stokes and some residents of the Coit Rd. area had said the prison would lower property values and pose a security problem for residents. White said studies showed there was no basis for such fears and that the area would become safer and property values would increase.

Prosser said Seiter based his decision on the majority report of the advisory committee that studied the Coit Rd. site. The committee approved it by a 5-4 vote.

"This has not been an easy public decision to make but I sincerely believe the long-term results will prove it to be the correct one," Seiter wrote Hannah.

"Housing prices will automatically go down. Would you buy a house next to a prison?" Pearson asked.

"Now maybe everybody in the area will have to buy a gun. This is wrong, entirely wrong. I feel like the black politicians sold us out. I'm going to wait and face them on election day."

But Sebe Young, an advisory council member who supported the site, said he believed the reformatory would bring jobs and attract service industries.

"I'm 65 years old. I saw this community deteriorate. I saw the exodus to the suburbs. People, grocery stores, everything," Young said.

Asked about people who oppose the prison because they fear for their safety, Young said, "That's kind of ludicrous. It's not a prison who's going to rape your daughter. It's the man who hasn't been sent to prison."

Prosser said the reformatory would be screened from nearby homes by landscaping and that two electrified fences would surround it.

The reformatory will be the area's first. It is one of 12 new facilities planned to meet the growing prison population, now totaling 19,500 in 12 institutions.

NEIGHBORHOOD IS HOT ABOUT STATE CORRECTIONS DECISION

(By Dave Rowe)

The state and its prison apparently are going to move in and already, residents of the Coit Road area are thinking seriously of moving out.

"I'm going to consider it, and so are a lot of my neighbors," said longtime Coit Road homeowner John Baker upon learning that the state now definitely plans to build a 500-bed, medium security reformatory on the site of the old Fisher Body plant. "The property values are going to go down, and who is going to want to live in a prison camp?"

"Why put this in a residential area? They could put it out in the country somewhere," Baker said. "We've got kids here; they can't go out and play next to a prison."

"I'm bitterly against the prison, and against what it represents," said Earl Ellis, Baker's neighbor. "We protested against this think and it didn't do a darn bit of good. We even had rich people from Bratenahl protesting and it didn't do any good."

"The state doesn't give a darn about anyone's property but its own."

During the debate preceding last week's decision, corrections department officials and State Sen. Michael White (D-21) had maintained that a prison would pose no safety threat to the neighborhood and that property values would actually increase, due to housing needs of prison employees.

"That's not what's going to happen," argued Michael Moore, another Coit Road resident. Moore, who bought his home there 12 years ago, now is taking steps to sell it. "This neighborhood is going to become totally a rental area, which means it's going to go down. Right now, most people are homeowners, but a lot of them are saying they aren't going to stay."

Moore believes efforts of Ward 10 Councilman Larry Jones and Cong. Louis Stokes (D-21) have fallen short of convincing the state to build elsewhere largely due to the lack of accountability of other elected officials.

"I think the neighborhood has been totally sold out," Moore said. "It's been sold out by Mike White, (State Rep.) Ike Thompson and by Gov. (Richard) Celeste. It's been clear from the start that the majority of people are totally against it. I think that, if they gave it a little time, the Fisher Body plant could be developed."

Dave Champion, the Park Corp.'s first and still only tenant in the huge old plant, also is unhappy with the state's decision. "With all the problems of a start-up, I certainly didn't need this," said Champion, who leased space before the state's interest in the site became public knowledge.

Bar Stop Inc., Champion's business, began customizing steel coils there last month, but Champion now is looking into potential relocation sites. "I'm going to look at a site on E. 55th Street. I'd like to stay in this area."

In the minority of area residents pleased with the news was Vernon Hollins of Coit Road. "It's excellent—it means more jobs and what this neighborhood needs is more jobs," Hollins said. "A lot of people around here don't have cars. As long as they hire people from around here, it'll be all right."

REPRESENTATIVE STOKES ADDS VOICE TO FIGHT AGAINST PRISON

(By Jim Parker)

Some 300 residents of Wards 10 and 11 cheered, applauded and amended last night while their leaders, from Congress to City Council, told them why there should be no prison in the aging, changed Collinwood community.

Leading the ticket and telling his enthusiastic audience what it wanted to hear was Rep. Louis Stokes, D-21, of Warrensville Heights.

"It is rare that I find myself in the district on a Thursday night," the nine-term congressman said, "but there is a crisis situation confronting the community tonight, and we," he said gesturing around him at the gathered political and community leaders behind the pulpit, "are here to tell you the facts."

The facts, Stokes said, are that the first proposed chairman of the citizens advisory committee on the \$39-million, 500-bed medium security prison was Walter A. Burks, president of Burks Development Co., employer of State Sen. Michael R. White, D-21, and a potential contractor on the job.

White is a chief sponsor of the proposal to put the prison in the abandoned General Motors site on Coit Rd. near E. 140th St.

Stokes acknowledged that modern penal thought advocates putting prisons nearer urban areas, but "it is unknown anywhere to build one in the inner city," he said.

"If the people in that area don't want a prison, then that is my position. I don't want a prison in that part of my congressional district," Stokes said.

Later, Stokes introduced his two appointments to the advisory committee, neither of whom, perhaps strangely, live in the area.

Martha Smith, introduced by Stokes as a prolific writer and a member of The Plain Dealer's Editorial Board of Contributors, said she was initially denied her vote when she explained she could not make a particular meeting and was told the vote would not be until the next day.

She said she was allowed to vote the next day by phone.

Carl Anderson, introduced by Stokes as a Boston College graduate and a trial attorney, said he was present at the meeting where the vote was taken, but left early to study some reports.

Anderson said he was called the next day and told a vote had been taken. He asked what it was and said he was told that if he voted the way they expected it would be 5-5.

"I felt I must abstain and must make public that the process is tainted," Anderson said he told the Rev. James Hannah, committee chairman.

The committee approved the hotly contested proposal 5-4. Anderson's no vote would have resulted in a tie that would have been broken by the chairman's vote.

Hannah said later the motion to vote was made by one of the minority voters, and said there was no ramrod. Hannah said he would have cast a yes vote if needed.

Councilman Larry Jones, D-10, was joined by Councilman Michael D. Polensek, D-11, in telling the mixed, but mostly black audience that it was not too late to fight and pointed to a unanimous resolution from council opposing the prison.

Also present and acknowledged by Stokes was David Kramer, 30, a Democratic candidate for mayor.

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE USE AND MISUSE OF POWER

(By Martha L. Smith)

I am a member of the committee which met to decide the suitability of the old Fisher Body auto plant as a site for a 500-1,000 bed prison. Even though I was part of the minority who felt a prison should not be built at that location, these thoughts are not primarily about the merits of either position. It is a look at the use and misuse of power.

I do not live in Collinwood and therefore am not directly affected by the final choice. What offends me as a black and as an American is the cavalier and insulting decision to build the prison despite the overwhelming resistance of the community.

I joined the committee willing to consider the kind of sound evidence that might outweigh my basic conviction that it is rankst paternalism to presume to know what is best for another adult.

Certain local and state politicians, the Cleveland media and those who have the audacity to prescribe for others the medicine they would not take for themselves are afflicted with a malady suffered by many of our predecessors—the Tory who did not share the Minuteman's thirst for freedom, Dred Scott's master who was chagrined that this famous slave craved liberty. At the core, it is a lack of respect for people and a failure to understand that the end does not justify the means.

The ugly ghost of racial discrimination, still defying all attempts to lay it to rest, is a strong factor here. Two Greater Cleveland neighborhoods (both white) considered as possible sites for an urban prison declined that honor. They were respected. A black

community which similarly declined was not.

A Plain Dealer editorial on the topic purposely confuses the bone of contention. "But several industries are near the site—which was a Fisher Body auto plant for decades—long before most of the current neighbors lived nearby. They knew that area before they moved in."

An industry and a prison are hardly synonymous. It adds insult to injury to suggest that this is so. Such a lame defense implies a lack of strong and convincing argument.

As a black American and a realist, I am quite aware of the need for prison reform. I subscribe fully to the idea that prisons should be accessible to visiting family and friends. I know that blacks are more likely than whites to be incarcerated for minor offenses, more likely to receive capital punishment. I know all the social and spiritual ills that feed the criminal justice system. I also know that it is highly lucrative, and reform is not the goal of many of those who profit from its present form.

What I fail to understand is how building a soon-to-be overcrowded prison on Coit Rd. will address prison reform issues. What I don't know is why white protests were honored and black protests were dismissed as the ignorant whining of persons who haven't enough sense to know what is good for them.

Another point must be made: It seems that the white politicians who represented the neighborhoods which turned down the golden opportunity to improve their communities with a prison listened to their constituents. They told prison director Richard Seiter thanks but no thanks. Some black political representatives apparently chose to do otherwise. They ignored their constituents. The oppressed turning oppressor is a sad and fascinating phenomenon.

If the prison is built on Coit Rd., in the face of overwhelming community opposition and insufficient space to humanely house 500 prisoners, it will be another chapter in the countless volumes on the misuse of power.

Force feeding, even for high and noble aims, is never the better way. When it is used to reach goals which, when shorn of rhetoric have little merit; it is not only dehumanizing but ultimately counterproductive.

IT SEEMS CHEAPER TO BUILD PRISONS

(By Richard M. Peery)

A couple of seemingly unrelated decisions in the past few weeks may tell more about the future of this community than all of the ballyhooed study plans that periodically paper the city. Cleveland is not known for civic cooperation, but seldom have a pair of actions from separate governmental agencies matched so well.

Among the cutbacks the Cleveland Board of Education is making to cope with a budget crunch is closing the Woodland Job Center, a unique training institution that gives another chance to school dropouts and pupils who require special counseling and remedial training to make it into the workaday world.

At the same time, Gov. Richard F. Celeste, Mayor George V. Volnovich and other leading local politicians have put their stamp of approval on a proposal to build a prison on the site of the former General Motors Coit Rd. factory where thousands used to work.

The job center's average enrollment has been about 500 students a quarter. The \$38

million medium security reformatory is to have room for 500 inmates.

Only an uninformed cynic would suggest a deliberate connection. The decision makers in the school system certainly did not base the job center closing on communication with the prison builders. It's just that the facts dovetail so well.

But any similarity ends when it comes to the way community leaders have reacted to the two proposals. There was no response from local officeholders when the school board members said they were closing the job center reluctantly as a money saving move. On the other hand, a lot of elected officials have turned the prison's construction into a crusade.

These are politicians who remained absolutely silent as the school board laid off teachers' aides, reduced the staffs at magnet schools and got entirely out of the business of training adults in apprenticeship programs.

Yet, many of the politicians have shown the greatest compassion for the plight of prisoners in overcrowded jails. Their sympathy is certainly justified. Ohio's prisons are mass atrocities. State Sen. Michael White, D-21, is absolutely right when he says prisons should be built where family members and social service professionals have easy access to aid in rehabilitation.

But maybe just building more cells is an exercise in simplistic straw grasping rather than a serious way to meet the problems of overcrowded prisons and the fear of crime.

New prisons that are supposed to relieve overcrowding often have a way of becoming jammed beyond capacity themselves. There are more people behind bars now than ever before in history and they are serving longer sentences. Yet, the fear of crime does not seem to abate. Maybe we should be trying some other things with the money.

One of them could be keeping places like the Woodland Job Center open. Such schools might accurately be called prison-preventers because they train people to earn their own way. Poverty does not force anyone into a life of crime, but the best evidence is that it makes an illegal career harder to avoid. It's easier to be law-abiding when you have money in your pocket.

Records show that more than half of the job center's graduates have gone on to become wage earners. That's a lot when you consider the chances of the unskilled before they came to the school.

Of course, schools are less spectacular than prison projects. And those politicians whose mouths water when they smell construction contracts may not see the value of building people instead of buildings.

But wouldn't it be nice if they put as much energy into giving people a chance to keep out of jail as they do in fighting for new places to put them?

LINING UP AT THE TROUGH

A good case for building a prison in Collinwood is being undermined by the propensity of certain politicians to indulge in cronyism, conflicts of interests and political feuds.

The Coit Rd. decision was no sooner announced when it was learned that the property owner, Park Corp., is represented by Council President George L. Forbes' law firm. Park had had a hard time unloading the former Fisher Body plant. With the state coming to the rescue, it remains to be seen whether the state will buy it for the \$300,000 that Park has said the property is worth.

In recent days, Rep. Louis Stokes has been blasting a potential challenger for his job—state Sen. Michael White—for promoting a prison in Cleveland to benefit White's private-sector boss, Walter Burks. White no longer works for the Burks Development Co., which was to oversee the prison construction. But having a different title in Burks' empire does not change the aroma of a conflict.

Nor is the air made any cleaner by the reported switch of Burks' contract from Coit Rd. to another prison project in Grafton. William Sykes, the state bureaucrat in charge of making crony decisions look rational, says no decision has been made on construction managers. Nonetheless, the word clearly is out in government and industry circles.

Burks also is co-manager of the W.O. Walker worker rehabilitation center being built, at long last, at Euclid Ave. and E. 105th St. The other manager is Snively Construction Co., whose owner, Thomas Snively, is a former business associate of Gov. Celeste's father, Frank.

Both Burks and Snively are experienced construction people. For a contractor to have political ties is not unusual, especially to get government contracts. Since Burks is a longtime friend and supporter of the governor, he did not need White to put in a word with Celeste. But White did help rally public support for the Coit site. Otherwise, Cleveland would have lost the prison to Grafton, and with it a separate construction contract.

White stuck his neck out politically in behalf of the governor and the reform-minded concept of an urban location for a prison. He is savvy enough to have sought legal rulings on his ties to Burks. They may hold up technically, but they don't wash publicly. He and his wife both work for an employer getting a contract on a project White promoted.

The administration is right in seeking qualified minority contractors. And its deals with political chums may be no more rampant than in regimes that were more discrete. But the prison has dumped the governor into another quagmire. When Celeste promised an end to business as usual, nobody thought he meant doing business ineptly.

COIT CONTRACTORS GOT WORD EARLY (By John S. Long)

The state officially announced the construction managers for the Coit Rd. and Grafton prisons yesterday, nearly three weeks after it quietly selected and informed the companies they would be getting the work.

Gilbane Construction Co. will operate in a combined venture with Burks Development Co. and Polytech Inc. as construction manager at the Coit Rd. site, although the state has yet to purchase the location from the Park Corp.

Construction managers at the Grafton prison will include Turner Construction Co. along with Ozzanne Construction, Los Primos Inc. and Mary Zunt Associates.

Construction managers oversee building projects and generally are paid 5% of the total contract price. It is estimated each prison will cost \$40 million, so construction managers on each project would divide \$2 million.

The Plain Dealer reported last week the state had chosen Gilbane-Burks for Coit Rd. and Turner-Ozzanne for Grafton before it had announced that Coit Rd. would be the location for the Cleveland area prison.

But the state considered switching the contracts because the administration of Gov. Richard F. Celeste feared conflict of interest charges since State Sen. Michael R. White, D-21, of Cleveland, a main force supporting the selection of the Coit Rd. site, is a business partner of Walter Burks, president of Burks Development Co.

White said last week he disagreed with the idea of switching the contractors because it added to the appearance of a conflict.

Yesterday he said Gilbane-Burks competed and won and should not be penalized because of its associates or because of unfounded innuendo. "They won without involvement from me or the governor's office," White said.

Burks was not the only politically connected firm to be awarded a construction-management contract yesterday.

Los Primos, a Canton-based minority firm, is owned by Roy Gutierrez, a Canton lawyer who is also chairman of the Stark County Democratic Party. Mary Zunt is a former Cleveland city councilwoman.

Los Primos and Mary Zunt do not have the construction management background the other firms have and will provide "less technical and more supportive services to the management team," said Gretchen Hall, state Department of Administrative Services spokeswoman. Hall said she did not know what those services entailed.

The Coit Rd. prison site has been a center of controversy among some area residents who said the prison would lower property values and be a security problem. This contingent has been led by Rep. Louis Stokes, D-21, of Warrensville Heights.

White has led those supporting the site. He has said studies show there was no basis for the fears. He predicted the area would become safer and property values would increase after the 500-bed prison was built.

The property had been a General Motors Corp. Fisher Body plant until the automaker halted production in August 1983. It was sold the next April.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, June 19, 1985]

CONFLICT DENIED, CLEVELAND JAIL PACT AWARDED (By John Funk)

Despite questions about conflict of interest, the Ohio Department of Administrative Services has awarded a Cleveland prison construction contract to a former employer of state Sen. Mike White, D-Cleveland, a chief proponent of the prison.

The department, a division of Gov. Richard F. Celeste's administration that awards contracts and makes purchases, awarded on Tuesday the construction of the Coit Road prison to a consortium of three companies, including the Burks Development Co.

Until June 1, Burks employed Sen. White as a sales representative. He also did administrative work for the company. Additionally, company president Walter Burks and White have been business partners in the recent past.

When it became clear that Burks was a contender for the \$30 million Coit Road prison project, U.S. Rep. Louis Stokes, D-Warrensville Heights, and others raised questions about a possible conflict of interest. White acknowledged the appearance of a conflict but denied any and said he had kept state officials, including the attorney general, apprised on his situation.

White said last week that he had been cleared of any potential conflict of interest.

He said his decision to quit Burks was unrelated.

Gretchen Hull, a spokesperson for Administrative Services, had no comment Tuesday on the question of conflict of interest.

Burks, a minority-headed company, will be paired with Polytech, another minority-headed company, and the Gilbane Building Co., a major contractor, Ms. Hull said.

Gilbane-Polytech is the joint venture contractor for the Sohio Building in downtown Cleveland.

"Obviously, the administration is anxious to aid and develop small, minority firms. And the best way is to link them with large companies like this," Ms. Hull said. Stokes could not be reached for comment Tuesday.

Administrative Services also awarded a second prison construction contract for \$36 million in Grafton to a similar joint venture of minority-headed firms tied to a major contractor. That joint venture will involve the Turner Construction Co. and minority firms of Ozzanne Construction, Los Primos and Mary Zunt Associates.

Ms. Zunt is a former Cleveland council member.

Ms. Hull said she could not comment on reports from sources close to the prison projects that the state had planned to switch the two projects to avoid the appearance of a conflict.

The state is negotiating to buy a 46-acre parcel at Coit Road and East 140th Street in Cleveland for the new 500-bed medium security prison, Ms. Hull said.

In addition to Stokes, Cleveland City Council is opposed to a prison at that location because it is a residential area.

[From the Plain Dealer, July 1, 1985]

STATE READY TO PAY 16 TIMES LAST PRICE OF PRISON SITE LAND

(By Joseph D. Rice and John Long)

Ohio has budgeted \$3 million to \$5 million to buy land for a prison site in Cleveland. The owner of the land paid \$300,000 for it about a year ago. The state could have bought the land for \$1.8 million about 18 months ago.

Daniel Shields, state public works director, said a new appraisal of the property, the former General Motors Corp.'s Fisher Body plant on Coit Rd. near E. 140th St., should be done by August.

State Corrections Director Richard P. Seiter said he expected to pay less than \$3 million to \$5 million for the land, but declined to discuss the amount he had in mind.

"But everybody that's dealt with me thinks I'm pretty cheap, from the corporations to the contract managers," said Seiter.

The state refused to pay \$1.8 million for the land nearly 18 months ago. About three months later, GM sold the property to a non-profit group that resold it the same day to Park Corp., the present owner.

Park Corp. stands to reap millions in profit—as much as \$8.5 million by one estimate—from sale of the land and auctioning equipment bought separately.

County Auditor J. Timothy McCormack assessed the property at \$8.2 million in 1983 when GM said it was worth \$4.8 million. Park Corp. has asked the county board of revision, which decides appeals on tax appraisals, to cut the value to \$300,000.

Park bought it for \$300,000 in April 1984 from the National Council for Community Development Inc. Park Corp. paid \$200,000 for equipment GM left. The equipment was

assessed by the county at \$3.9 million in 1984.

Earlier this month, Park auctioned off much of the equipment. Park officials did not return numerous calls from The Plain Dealer seeking to find out how much the equipment sold for. If the auction brought the full assessed value and the state paid \$5 million, Park could realize a profit of \$8.5 million.

GM closed the 65-year-old Coit Rd. plant in September 1983 and tried to sell the 1.6 million-square-foot building and its 46 acres or donate them to charity and take a tax deduction.

In late 1983, Ostendorf-Morris Co., a Cleveland company specializing in selling commercial property, approached the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction about buying the plant as a penitentiary site. Joseph Ditchman, Ostendorf-Morris vice president, said GM wanted \$1.8 million but was open to offers.

Seiter said he rejected the offer because the state was looking then for at least 70 acres for a 1,250-bed medium-security prison. Earlier this year, Seiter changed plans and decided to move 750 of the proposed beds to the Grafton prison, in Lorain County, and build a 500-bed prison on the smaller Coit Rd. site.

In early 1984, GM offered the property to the National Council, a nonprofit New York corporation that tries to create jobs and build tax bases in cities. National Council initially rejected the idea.

"GM came to us and said they wanted to donate the property to us," said National Council Executive Director Robert W. Davenport. "We said, 'That's very kind, but we have no way of taking care of it and won't accept it until we have a buyer for it.'"

Canter said under federal tax law, GM could not restrict future use of the property if the corporation wanted a tax deduction.

Davenport said the council did not restrict future use when it sold the plant to Park. "It was our understanding and Park's intention to subdivide it and turn it into smaller units," Davenport said. "I have no reason to believe they (Park) weren't totally sincere when they took the property from us."

"Our whole public purpose is to create jobs for the community. We never would have stood still for the type of transaction (for a prison) that it is now likely to be."

"When I found out that was going to be turned into a prison, I was in a state of shock. That's not what we intended it to be," Davenport said.

Davenport said nothing can be done because Park owns the property. In future sales, he said, he will try to write in guarantees so the land will be used only to create jobs.

Davenport said he did not know how the sale price to Park was agreed on, and speculated it might have been the only offer the council received. But a realtor involved in the sale, who asked not to be identified, said many people had been interested in the property.

The PD, without mentioning names, described the deal to IRS spokesman Steve Pyrek in Washington and asked if the sale for below market value violated any laws.

Pyrek said of the transactions, "It doesn't sound to me as if it should be . . . but I'm not expert. It sounds real shady, but I don't know specifically if it is."

Pyrek said there was nothing wrong with a non-profit organization's obtaining property and selling it the same day, as long as "the charity sells the land for fair market value."

When asked whether the IRS considered a \$300,000 price tag for land valued between \$5 million and \$8 million as fair market value, Pyrek said it depended on the specific circumstances of the sale.

"That brings up all sorts of questions," said Pyrek. "It could be a problem, it is quite possible that is a problem, but it is tough to generalize in cases like these."

"There is no obligation to sell at fair market value," Canter said. "The market value assumes you had a rational profit maximizer, with wherewithal to maximize potential Charities don't."

"If you are a charity and you receive a property, what are you going to do with it? You liquidate it. Any charity will liquidate as soon as possible," Canter said.

National Council found a buyer—Park Corp.—through Ostendorf-Morris.

The sale to the council and then to Park occurred about the month after Park officials learned the land had been discussed as a potential site for a prison, sources told The Plain Dealer. Soon after it purchased the Coit Rd. land, Park resumed sale talks with state corrections officials.

Davenport said the council got the GM plant in a "bargain sale. A bargain sale is the technical name for a donation which is (part) donation and part sale," explained Davenport in a letter to Rep. Louis Stokes' office.

Davenport told Stokes, D-21, of Warrensville Heights, an opponent of building a prison on Coit Rd., the council did not know Park Corp. would try to sell the land to the state for a prison.

"A prison does not meet the economic development objectives the council pursues," Davenport's letter said. "Had we any idea that the property would be so utilized, we would not have participated in the transaction."

The council also does not become involved in a piece of property with "a negative social, or economic nature," he wrote.

[From the Plain Dealer, July 7, 1985]

PLAYING "THE PRICE IS RIGHT"

In a deal with a repugnant odor, Ohio may spend two or three times as much as it could have spent 18 months ago for the Coit Rd. prison site.

Not that anything has been proven illegal, mind you, but something is seriously wrong when \$3 million to \$5 million is set aside for property that was offered for \$1.8 million in late 1983.

Something is seriously wrong when estimated values and actual sales vary widely. The county auditor assessed the former auto plant at \$8.2 million in 1983, but General Motors claimed it to be worth \$4.8 million. In a tax writeoff, GM unloaded it for \$300,000 to a charity, which instantly resold land and buildings for that amount, but profited by peddling \$3.9 million in equipment for \$200,000.

Something is seriously wrong when the state could wind up paying a whopping 10 to 16 times more than the Park Corp. paid for the same property in April 1984.

Perhaps the politically connected Park Corp. simply was practicing basic free enterprise by shrewd deals. If property and equipment resales bring top dollar, Park could realize more than \$8 million on a \$500,000 investment—made only after Park learned the state was interested in the site.

Perhaps something more is involved in this tidy arrangement that would involve millions of tax dollars. How can there be such wild swings in the value of a piece of

property—from \$8.2 million down to \$300,000 then up to as much as \$5 million—all in just two years?

The Celeste administration does not have to pay as much as is provided in the new state budget. The \$5 million is maximum. Nor does Park, which must continue to do business in this city and state, need to ask an exorbitant price.

There are sound reasons that favor building a prison in Cleveland and using the Coit Rd. property. But so far the project has reinforced the state's experience that it is nearly impossible to do anything constructive in Cleveland because of chronic political infighting and money shenanigans. The price play as the kind of issue that twitches the nostrils of IRS sleuths, enrages the tax-paying public and enlivens a gubernatorial campaign.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STRANG) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PORTER, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PEPPER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RODINO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MAZZOLI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MACKEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MAVROULES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LUNDINE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SEIBERLING, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, September 4.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, September 5.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, September 6.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER, during debate on H.R. 3008, in the Committee of the Whole, today.

Mr. COUGHLIN, during consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 168, today.

Mrs. BENTLEY, prior to the vote on the amendment in disagreement on the supplemental appropriations on water resources in the Committee of the Whole, today.

Mr. BROOKS, prior to passage of H.R. 1460, in the Committee of the Whole, today.

Mr. NIELSON of Utah, prior to the vote on House Resolution 241, today.

Mr. LOWERY of California, in support of the conference report on Senate

Concurrent Resolution 32, first concurrent resolution on the budget, fiscal year 1986, prior to the vote thereon.

Mr. STOKES, and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds 2 pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$1,932.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STRANG) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CHENEY in two instances.
Mr. RITTER.
Mr. SENSENBRENNER in two instances.
Mr. WOLF.
Mr. WORTLEY in two instances.
Mr. MOORHEAD.
Mr. LAGOMARSINO in two instances.
Mr. GOODLING in two instances.
Mr. GILMAN in three instances.
Mr. KINDNESS.
Mr. SAXTON.
Mr. FAWELL.
Mr. GREEN.
Mr. COBEY in two instances.
Mr. McDADE in two instances.
Mr. CAMPBELL.
Mr. THOMAS of California.
Mr. GUNDERSON.
Mr. RINALDO.
Mrs. ROUKEMA in two instances.
Mr. LOTT in two instances.
Mrs. BENTLEY in two instances.
Mr. PURSELL.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. MILLER of Washington.
Ms. FIEDLER.
Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.
Mr. LENT.
Mrs. JOHNSON.
Mrs. VUCANOVICH.
Mr. DENNY SMITH.
Mr. GALLO.
Mr. PORTER in three instances.
Mr. COURTER.
Mr. LIVINGSTON.
Mr. JEFFORDS in two instances.
Mr. SWEENEY.
Mr. KEMP.
Mr. DORNAN of California in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JACOBS in two instances.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Mr. COELHO.
Mr. TALLON.
Mr. BEILENSON.
Mr. RANGEL in two instances.
Mr. PEASE.
Mr. MAZZOLI.
Mr. MINETA in two instances.
Mr. KANJORSKI.
Mr. DYMALLY.
Mr. SCHEUER.
Mr. HERTEL of Michigan.
Mr. DeLUGO.
Mr. GORDON.
Mr. ACKERMAN.
Mr. MAVROULES.
Mr. GARCIA in three instances.
Mr. ANDREWS.
Mr. LANTOS in four instances.

Mr. LIPINSKI in three instances.
Mr. BARNES.
Mr. HAYES.
Mr. FASCELL in three instances.
Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut in three instances.
Mr. TALLON.
Mr. ROYBAL in two instances.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. APPELGATE in two instances.
Mr. SAVAGE.
Mr. YATRON.
Mr. MARKEY in three instances.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mr. SMITH of Florida.
Mrs. KENNELLY in two instances.
Mr. SOLARZ.
Mr. WAXMAN.
Ms. MIKULSKI in three instances.
Mr. STARK in three instances.
Mr. AuCOIN in three instances.
Mr. TORRES in two instances.
Mr. WIRTH in three instances.
Mr. CLAY in two instances.
Mr. ANTHONY in two instances.
Mr. STALLINGS.
Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. MILLER of California.
Mr. LUNDINE.
Mr. RALPH M. HALL.
Mr. HOYER in two instances.
Mr. FLORIO.
Mr. LIPINSKI in three instances.
Mr. MATSUI in two instances.
Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania.
Mr. BEDELL.
Mr. HAWKINS in two instances.
Mr. STOKES in three instances.
Mr. KOSTMAYER in three instances.
Mr. BROOKS.
Mr. OBERSTAR.
Mr. WAXMAN.
Mr. FAUNTROY.
Mr. RAHALL in two instances.
Mr. LELAND.
Mrs. BOGGS.
Mr. BIAGGI.
Mr. HUBBARD in two instances.
Ms. OAKAR.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 63. An act to encourage the rendering of in-flight emergency care aboard aircraft by requiring the placement of emergency first aid medical supplies and equipment aboard aircraft and by relieving appropriate persons of liability for the provision and use of such equipment and supplies; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

S. 974. An act to provide for protection and advocacy for mentally ill persons; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 1106. An act to provide for the use and distribution of funds appropriated in satisfaction of judgments awarded to the Saginaw Chippewa Tribe of Michigan in dockets numbered 57, 59, and 13E of the Indian Claims Commission and docket numbered 13F of the United States Claims Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1349. An act to provide for the use and distribution of funds awarded in docket 363 to the Mdewakanton and Wahpekute Eastern or Mississippi Sioux before the United States Court of Claims and Claims Court; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1515. An act to authorize a partial transfer of the authority of the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority to the States of Maine and New Hampshire; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

S. 1529. An act to authorize appropriations for State and community highway safety grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1195. An act to amend title 3, United States Code, to authorize the use of penalty and franked mail efforts relating to the location and recovery of missing children, and

S.J. Res. 180. Joint resolution commemorating the tenth anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 179, I move that the House do now adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, September 4, 1985.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 179, 99th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12 o'clock noon, Wednesday, September 4, 1985.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 179, the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 4, 1985, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1804. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of the President's ninth special message dated May 16, 1985, proposing two rescissions of budget authority, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685 (H. Doc. No. 99-93); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1805. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of proposed sale of defense articles in excess of \$50,000,000 from inventories of regular components of the Armed Forces or

current production, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 133b (96 Stat. 1288); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1806. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of proposed sale or transfer of defense articles to Norway in excess of \$50,000,000 from inventories of regular components of the Armed Forces or current production, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 133b (96 Stat. 1288); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1807. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of final regulations regarding the final list of critical languages under title II of the Education for Economic Security Act, pursuant to GEPA, section 431(d)(1) (88 Stat. 567; 90 Stat. 2231; 95 Stat. 453); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1808. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting notification of the President's determination that it is important to U.S. security interests to provide FAA funds to Jamaica under the special authority of section 614 of the act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2364(a)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1809. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a notice of intent of offer to sell certain defense articles or services to Norway (Transmittal No. 85-47), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1810. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a notice of intent of offer to sell certain defense articles or services to Japan (Transmittal No. 85-48), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1811. A letter from the Chief Immigration Judge, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting a report on the suspension of deportation of certain aliens of good character and with required residency when deportation causes hardship under section 244(a), Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to INA, section 244(c) (66 Stat. 214, 76 Stat. 1247); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1812. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for comprehensive reforms and to achieve greater equity in the compensation of attorneys pursuant to Federal statute in civil and administrative proceedings in which the United States, or a State or local government, is a party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1813. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report on the origin, contents, destination and disposition of all humanitarian goods and supplies to countries in Central America, pursuant to Public Law 98-525, section 1540(e) (98 Stat. 2538); jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

1814. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reduce costs in the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1815. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Indian health authorities, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FASCELL: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 1460 (Rept. No. 99-242). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 250. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2372, a bill authorizing appropriations for carrying out the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970, and for other purposes. (Rept. 99-243). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WHEAT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 251. Resolution warning certain points of order against the conference report on H.R. 1460, a bill to express the opposition of the United States to the system of apartheid in South Africa, and for other purposes. (Rept. 99-244). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. Tentative report on subdivision of budget totals for fiscal year 1986 (Rept. 99-245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1520. A bill to promote and expand the vitality of the United States copper industry; with amendments (Rept. 99-246, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1232. A bill to provide a comprehensive system of liability and compensation for oil-spill damage and removal costs, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 99-247 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 253. A Resolution waving points of order on rules against and providing procedures for consideration of the conference report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 and revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1985, or any amendment in disagreement thereto. (Rept. 99-248). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania: Committee of Conference. Conference report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 (filed in disagreement). (Rept. 99-249). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 2475 (Rept. 99-250). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. OBEY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 3228. A bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes (Rept. 99-252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. HOWARD: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 6. A bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources and the improvement and rehabilitation of the Nation's water resources infrastructure; with

an amendment; referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for a period ending not later than September 5, 1985, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for a period ending not later than September 15, 1985, and to the Committee on Ways and Means for a period ending not later than September 23, 1985, for consideration of such portions of the amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of those committees pursuant to clauses 1 (l), (n) and (v), rule X, respectively (Rept. 99-251, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2817. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes; with an amendment; referred, for a period ending not later than 10 calendar days after either the Committee on Public Works and Transportation or the Committee on Ways and Means reports the bill, whichever occurs first, to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration of such portions of Titles I through III of the bill and amendment as fall within its jurisdiction pursuant to clause 1(m) of rule X, and to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for consideration of such portions of titles I and II, except for section 206, of the bill and amendment as fall within its jurisdiction pursuant to clause 1(n) of rule X (Rept. 99-253, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

H.R. 3155. A bill to amend chapter 44 (relating to firearms) of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. LENT):

H.R. 3156. A bill to revise, consolidate, and enact certain laws related to admiralty and maritime liability as subtitles I and III of title 46, United States Code, "Shipping"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3157. A bill to revise, consolidate, and enact certain laws related to maritime liability for personal property and goods as chapters 307 and 309 of title 46, United States Code, "Shipping"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3158. A bill to revise, consolidate, and enact certain laws related to maritime commercial instruments and liens and public vessels and goods as chapters 313 and 315 of title 46, United States Code, "Shipping"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 3159. A bill to establish the Crisis Management Council for the purpose of studying international political, economic, and military happenings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JEFFORDS:

H.R. 3160. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to establish a permanent program to support the price of milk, to amend the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 to establish the National Dairy Re-

search Endowment Institute, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BENTLEY:

H.R. 3161. A bill to restrict payments to alien recipients of Social Security benefits and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 3162. A bill to require the President to take certain actions to obtain relief from nontariff trade barriers imposed by foreign countries against agricultural goods produced in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 3163. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to clarify the derivative works exception to the termination of a copyright grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. LENT):

H.R. 3164. A bill to amend section 607 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to ensure consistent use of funds made available for capital construction of vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BONKER:

H.R. 3165. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1986 for the purpose of expanding and modernizing the facilities of the Coordinating Committee on Export Controls and to provide for appointment by the Secretary of State of the members of the U.S. Permanent Delegation to the Coordinating Committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BONKER (for himself, Mr. MICA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. ROTH, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. ZSCHAU):

H.R. 3166. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 with respect to the activities of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BREAU (for himself and Mr. Young of Alaska):

H.R. 3167. A bill to establish a National Fish Hatchery System within the Fish and Wildlife Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 3168. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to prepare an annual report consolidating the available data on the geographic distribution of Federal funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DELAY:

H.R. 3169. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to issue, on a nationwide basis, a general permit for the discharge of dredged and fill material into certain navigable waters; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 3170. A bill to increase the rate of compensation of citizen members of the National Capital Planning Commission from \$100 per day to the daily equivalent of the rate established for positions at level IV of the Executive Schedule, and to establish the responsibilities of such Commission relating to demolitions; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H.R. 3171. A bill to require persons who obtain or renew oil or gas leases with the

United States to have a plan for contracting with minority firms for activities undertaken under the leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDGAR (for himself and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3172. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a national assessment of the extent to which radon gas formed from naturally occurring deposits of uranium is a threat to public health, to authorize a demonstration program to test methods of eliminating the threat to public health from radon gas, and to authorize disaster relief assistance for releases of radon gas; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FAWELL (for himself, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. GROTEBERG):

H.R. 3173. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide an exemption from the minimum wage and overtime requirements of that act for employees of State and local public agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRANK (for himself, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BATES, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. RUSSO, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WIRTH, and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 3174. A bill to amend chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, to allow members of the Armed Forces to sue the United States for damages for certain injuries caused by improper medical care; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H.R. 3175. A bill to require Romania to comply with the Consular Convention and Protocol of July 5, 1972, as a condition of continued preferential trade treatment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 3176. A bill to amend the Arms Export Control Act to increase the penalties for certain violations under that act; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Judiciary.

By Mr. JEFFORDS:

H.R. 3177. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to require that all the members of the Federal Council on the Aging be appointed by the President, by and

with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JENKINS (for himself, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. COELHO, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. THOMAS of California):

H.R. 3178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code in order to clarify the right of cooperatives to net earnings and losses among patronage allocation units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KENNELLY (for herself, Mr. PICKLE, and Mr. ARCHER):

H.R. 3179. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that employees may make certain contributions to provide for cost-of-living protection under a defined benefit plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KENNELLY (for herself, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 3180. A bill to permanently exempt from the Federal unemployment tax wages paid to full-time students employed by summer camps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINDNESS:

H.R. 3181. A bill to provide for comprehensive reforms and to achieve greater equity in the compensation of attorneys pursuant to Federal statute in civil and administrative proceedings in which the United States, or a State or local government, is a party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN of California (for himself, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. COELHO, and Mr. THOMAS of California):

H.R. 3182. A bill to authorize the construction of the Mid-Valley Unit of the Central Valley Project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. LLOYD:

H.R. 3183. A bill to prohibit permanently the issuance of regulations on the taxation of fringe benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3184. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow employers a tax credit for hiring displaced homemakers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUKEN:

H.R. 3185. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to determine the effectiveness of State vehicle emission control inspection and maintenance programs before implementing the additional State plan requirements under the Clean Air Act applicable to such programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUNDINE (for himself, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 3186. A bill to authorize a price support program for the 1986 and succeeding crops of peanuts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself and Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH):

H.R. 3187. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for a

United States Immigration Court, to reform adjudication procedures and asylum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 3188. A bill to strengthen the counterintelligence capabilities of the Department of Defense, to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to establish penalties for espionage in peacetime, to create a Presidential Commission to study the effectiveness of the changes made in this legislation, to provide increased penalties for espionage, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, the Judiciary, Government Operations, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. SIKORSKI):

H.R. 3189. A bill to reform the Residential Conservation Service and the Commercial and Apartment Conservation Service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.R. 3190. A bill entitled: "The Higher Education Disclosure Act"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (by request):

H.R. 3191. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require that non-Federal providers of hospital care and services receiving direct payment of Medicare funds for services to Medicare beneficiaries provide similar services to VA beneficiaries under similar VA payment policies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3192. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the authority of the Chief Medical Director or designee regarding disciplinary actions on certain probationary title 38 health care employees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3193. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to remove the requirement that the Administrator administer garage and parking appropriations and fees as a revolving fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 3194. A bill to expedite the hearing of claims under the Black Lung Benefits Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 3195. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for floating social security tax rates for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 3-percent trigger for cost-of-living adjustments, and to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1983 to provide that off-budget treatment for the OASDI trust funds and the hospital insurance trust fund take effect for fiscal year 1987 in lieu of fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 3196. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to limit the liability for negligence of U.S. registered pilots navigating vessels on the Great Lakes so as to provide for reciprocal and equitable participation by United States and Canadian citizens in the pilotage of vessels on the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PACKARD (for himself, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. SILJANDER):

H.R. 3197. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that days of unused sick leave may not be taken into account for purposes of computing any annuity under

the civil service retirement system; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PACKARD (for himself, Mr. DELAY, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. SILJANDER, and Mr. KINDNESS):

H.R. 3198. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that not more than 50 days of unused sick leave may be taken into account in computing an annuity under the civil service retirement system; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 3199. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States-Mexico Free Trade and Co-production Zone, a United States-Mexico Bilateral Commission, a Multilateral Commission on Immigration, and United States-Mexico Joint Development Bank, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs; Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; and Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROTH (by request):

H.R. 3200. A bill to amend the Trading with the Enemy Act in order to terminate the Office of Alien Property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA (for herself, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. OLIN, Mr. McKERNAN, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. COBEY):

H.R. 3201. A bill to provide that rates of pay for Members of Congress shall not be subject to adjustment under the Federal Salary Act of 1967 or subject to any automatic adjustment, to provide that any bill or resolution which would increase Members' pay or confer any tax benefit with respect to Members as a separate and distinct class may be passed or adopted (as the case may be) only by a recorded vote, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Rules.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA (for herself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SUNIA, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BONKER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. McKERNAN, Ms. OAKAR, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

H.R. 3202. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from changing reimbursement levels or methodologies for home health services under the Medicare program prior to October 1, 1986, or during a freeze period; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3203. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the establishment of employee stock ownership plans in a manner that will ensure that such plans are established by employers as permanent plans for the exclusive benefit of their employees; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Florida (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ROE, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. HAWKINS):

H.R. 3204. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to facilitate home

equity conversions through sale-leaseback transactions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. McKERNAN):

H.R. 3205. A bill to amend chapter 30 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for education assistance for apprenticeship or other on job training under the new GI bill educational assistance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STALLINGS (for himself, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 3206. A bill to provide for the minting and issuance of commemorative coins in recognition of great American scientists and their accomplishments; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. STALLINGS (for himself, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan):

H.R. 3207. A bill to provide for the minting of gold and silver bullion coins; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 3208. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the dollar limit on the amount of compensation which may be deferred under State and local government deferred compensation plans and to provide that amounts deferred under such plans shall be included in income only when paid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3209. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to exhaust administrative procedure established within the Internal Revenue Service for resolving dispute with a taxpayer before sending such taxpayer a notice of deficiency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3210. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to payment reform under part A of that title, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit continuation of health benefits coverage for certain uninsured individuals, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STENHOLM:

H.R. 3211. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 to encourage the use of innovative technologies, including technologies used by small businesses, for the cleanup of hazardous substances; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Public Works and Transportation, and Science and Technology.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH:

H.R. 3212. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust of the Reno Sparks Indian Colony; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH (for herself and Mr. REID):

H.R. 3213. A bill to settle certain claims affecting the Pyramid Lake Paiute Indian Tribe of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 3214. A bill to provide for the use and distribution of funds awarded to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians in United States Claims Court docket numbered 53-81L, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER (for himself and Mr. Lowry of Washington):

H.R. 3215. A bill entitled: The Pacific Northwest Power Authority Act of 1985; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WIRTH (for himself, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BATES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 3216. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to increase the availability of educational and informational television programs for children; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WIRTH (for himself, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. LELAND, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 3217. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize appropriations for public broadcasting; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 3218. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reauthorize and expand the revenue sources for the Superfund program; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 3219. A bill to provide a one-time amnesty from criminal and civil tax penalties for taxpayers who notify the Internal Revenue Service of previous underpayments of Federal tax and pay such underpayments in full with interest, and to provide that the revenues from such payments shall be used to reduce the Federal deficit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 3220. A bill to establish a commission to develop and submit to the Congress a comprehensive legislative plan for a conversion of defense-related industries and human resources of the United States to meet nonmilitary needs in the event of major international arms reductions; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Government Operations.

By Mr. MOODY (for himself, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. LEWIS of California):

H.R. 3222. A bill entitled: The National Motor Carrier Productivity and Safety Improvement Act; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.J. Res. 367. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that no person may be elected to the House of Representatives more than three times, and providing that no person may be elected to the Senate more than once; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTINEZ:

H.J. Res. 368. Joint resolution to designate the week of March 2, 1986, through March 8, 1986, as "National Young Writers' Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MICA:

H.J. Res. 369. Joint resolution to proclaim October 23, 1985, as "A Time of Remembrance" for all victims of terrorism throughout the world; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA:

H.J. Res. 370. Joint resolution conferring United States citizenship posthumously on Mrs. Mary Josephine Kaszkiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIRTH (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BEIL-

ENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BONKER, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COATS, Mr. COELHO, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FROST, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HEPTEL of Hawaii, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JENKINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MACK, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STRANG, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARR, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEHARDT, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. MAVEROULES, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. TORRES, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. PRICE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. ROEMER, Mrs. LONG, Mr. BARNES, Mr.

DYSON, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. REID, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WILSON, Mr. OLIN, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. WISE):

H.J. Res. 371. Joint resolution to designate March 16, 1986, as "Freedom of Information Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GROTEBERG (for himself, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FROST, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GALLO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. COBEY, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. DAUB):

H. Con. Res. 182. Concurrent resolution calling upon the Members of the Congress to actively support the United States Savings Bonds Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. Res. 249. Resolution establishing the Commission on the U.S. House of Representatives Bicentenary; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CHAPPELL (for himself, and Mr. CONTE):

H. Res. 252. Resolution to urge negotiators for major league baseball owners and players to quickly settle their differences and avoid a scheduled players' strike; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H. Res. 254. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should heed the proposals offered by families of the seven Americans still held hostage and initiate diplomatic measures based on such proposals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORD of Tennessee:

H. Res. 255. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should support any resolution of the United Nations recommending the imposition of certain economic sanctions against South Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DE LUIGO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. FUSTER):

H. Res. 256. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with regard to recent appointments to the National Advisory and Coordinating Council on Bilingual Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAVAGE (for himself, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. HAYES):

H. Res. 257. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a South Chicago Community Hospital Kidney Transplant Center should be approved by the Illinois Health Facilities Health Planning Board; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, and Mr. HAWKINS):

H. Res. 258. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to educational considerations that should be reflected in any reform of the In-

ternal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 3221. A bill to waive the time limitations relating to the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Tibor Rubin for distinguishing himself by acts of valor during the Korean war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 3223. A bill to permit Willie D. Harris to present a claim against the United States in the manner provided for in chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 3224. A bill deeming a sailing vessel owned by the San Diego Council of the Boy Scouts of America to have been built in the United States for purposes of qualification for the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LOWRY of Washington:

H.R. 3225. A bill for the relief of Salaheddine Assaad Chatila, Ghamra Chatila-Homsi, and Zouhair S. Chatila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKERNAN:

H.R. 3226. A bill for the relief of Guy R. Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 3227. A bill for the relief of Major Travis E. Kitchens, U.S. Air Force, Retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 38: Mr. COBEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HILER, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. STANGELAND.

H.R. 43: Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 66: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WORTLEY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. MACK.

H.R. 67: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WORTLEY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SHAW, Mr. DYSON, and Mr. MACK.

H.R. 77: Mr. HOYER, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. MOLINARI.

H.R. 106: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 126: Mr. MRAZEK and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 156: Mr. McEWEN.

H.R. 203: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 235: Mr. ROSE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. COELHO, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 237: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, and Mr. LOTT.

H.R. 281: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 417: Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 472: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LATTI, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. BLAZ.

H.R. 508: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. BONIOR of Michigan.

H.R. 528: Mr. GALLO.

H.R. 585: Ms. SNOWE and Mr. McKERNAN.

H.R. 615: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. HUTTO, and Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 616: Mr. BEILSON.

H.R. 734: Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ROE, Mr. HEPTTEL of Hawaii, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. SCHULZE.

H.R. 793: Mr. BOSCO.

H.R. 864: Mr. PARRIS.

H.R. 945: Mr. COBEY and Mr. LEATH of Texas.

H.R. 970: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 979: Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 983: Mr. DE LUCA, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FISH, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mrs. LONG, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONTE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. OLIN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. LENT, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. LUKE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 1021: Mr. PICKLE.

H.R. 1029: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 1059: Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. MCCAIN.

H.R. 1068: Mr. MINETA, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 1219: Mr. ZSCHAU, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1247: Mr. DELAY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. WHITTAKER, and Mr. IRELAND.

H.R. 1294: Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 1355: Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 1572: Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 1613: Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 1622: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1648: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.R. 1673: Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 1765: Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 1770: Mr. SABO.

H.R. 1853: Mr. BARNES and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1875: Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. RITTER, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 1918: Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.R. 2001: Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.R. 2020: Mr. FUSTER and Mr. WOLFE.

H.R. 2058: Mr. OWENS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 2134: Mr. BRUCE and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 2164: Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 2235: Mr. WOLFE and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.R. 2255: Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 2263: Mr. BATEMAN and Mr. SILJANDER.

H.R. 2280: Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COELHO, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. MACK, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

H.R. 2353: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 2383: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 2440: Mr. O'BRIEN and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 2472: Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 2523: Mr. DASCHLE.

H.R. 2530: Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BATES, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. MAVEROULES.

H.R. 2578: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 2591: Mr. WEBER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. WALKER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. COBEY, Mr. MACK, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 2594: Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 2596: Mr. WEBER, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FISH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MONSON, and Mr. COBEY.

H.R. 2607: Mr. BEDELL, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. McKERNAN.

H.R. 2621: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 2622: Mr. CLAY and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 2663: Mr. LEATH of Texas and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 2685: Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.R. 2687: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 2709: Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 2752: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 2768: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. BADHAM.

H.R. 2773: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. REID.

H.R. 2782: Mr. BARNES, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MINETA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SILJANDER, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 2785: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 2786: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 2793: Mr. SILJANDER.

H.R. 2803: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 2827: Mr. GALLO.

H.R. 2839: Mr. MORRISON of Washington.

H.R. 2840: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. SUNIA.

H.R. 2851: Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 2854: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. BEDELL.

H.R. 2870: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. HOYER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. NOWAK, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. ROE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CARR, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. WISE, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. SABO, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. DE LUCA, Mr. PURSELL, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. McEWEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. GALLO, Mr. BRUCE, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. LONG, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. DYSON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. DASCHLE.

H.R. 2873: Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. BRUCE.

H.R. 2876: Mr. FASCELL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WEAVER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr.

WHEAT, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. STARK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. YATES, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FRANK, Mr. CARPER, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MINETA, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. ANDERSON.

H.R. 2879: Mr. COELHO.

H.R. 2904: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 2936: Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 2954: Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DiOGUARDI, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 2955: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 2957: Mr. WEAVER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. SUNIA.

H.R. 2958: Mr. WEAVER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. SUNIA.

H.R. 3035: Mr. CROCKETT and Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 3041: Mr. HOYER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HORTON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.R. 3043: Mr. STUMP, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MONSON, Mr. DAUB, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BERUTER, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. ECKERT of New York, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. COBEY, Mr. SHUMWAY, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 3057: Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. COBEY, and Mr. DENNY SMITH.

H.R. 3064: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 3069: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3075: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 3082: Mr. BROWN of California and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 3083: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 3084: Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 3100: Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.R. 3109: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WORTLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. SILJANDER.

H.R. 3115: Mr. DASCHLE.

H.R. 3139: Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. ROGERS, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. SABO, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. REID, Mr. SISISKY, and Mr. KENNELLY.

H.J. Res. 27: Mr. GROTEBERG and Mr. DASCHLE.

H.J. Res. 94: Mr. LIGHTFOOT and Mr. SAXTON.

H.J. Res. 142: Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.J. Res. 151: Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. BOLAND, and Mr. PORTER.

H.J. Res. 171: Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. COATS, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. RITTER, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. WORT-

LEY, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. STRANG, and Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.J. Res. 207: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ADDABBO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.J. Res. 218: Mr. OWENS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SABO, Mr. MINETA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEVINE of California, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. YATRON, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. ROE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. DAUB, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MOODY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

H.J. Res. 221: Mr. PORTER, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ROE, and Mr. SILJANDER.

H.J. Res. 223: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. STARK, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. ORTIZ, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.J. Res. 262: Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.J. Res. 266: Mr. VOLKMER and Mr. HUBBARD.

H.J. Res. 277: Mr. SUNIA.

H.J. Res. 289: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LUNDINE, Ms. OAKAR, and Mr. PEPPER.

H.J. Res. 296: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SCHUETTE, and Mr. GUARINI.

H.J. Res. 300: Mr. COELHO, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. GALLO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. CHENEY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. YATRON, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LUNDINE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MacKAY, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GARCIA, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. STARK, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. GEHARDT, Mr. EARLY, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. McDADE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. OLIN, Mr. WISE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. LONG, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WOLF, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. OBEY, Mr. AuCOIN, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. REID, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HEPTLE of Hawaii, Mr. MINETA, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FIELDS, Mr.

ROTH, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. COBEY, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. ROEMER, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MONSON, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. UDALL, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FOWLER, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. McGRATH.

H.J. Res. 308: Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COURTER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DYSON, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. REID, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 314: Mr. WILSON, Mr. MOODY, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. DAUB, Mr. LELAND, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. ROE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. EARLY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. De LUCA, Mr. HYDE, Mr. VALENTINE, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DYSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. BERUTER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. COATS, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. LUKE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. REID, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HEPTLE of Hawaii, Mr. KEMP, Mr. FROST, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. SABO, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. YATRON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BATES, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FISH, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BARNES, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARR, Mr. HATCHER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ROEMER, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. McKERNAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. MOORE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FRANKLIN, and Mr. JACOBS.

H.J. Res. 320: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. REID, Mr. DYSON, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. COURTER.

H.J. Res. 327: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.J. Res. 351: Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. WEBER.

H.J. Res. 356: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SABO, Mr. WEISS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. ROE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. McGRATH.

H.J. Res. 357: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GALLO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. WEAVER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WEBER, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. SILJANDER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BEILENSEN, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.J. Res. 363: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. GALLO, Mr. DI GUARDI, Mrs.

LLOYD, Mr. RITTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. PORTER.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. ROYBAL.

H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. RITTER and Mr. TORICELLI.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. COATS, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. LUNGREN.

H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. WHITEHURST.

H. Con. Res. 136: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. HENRY, Mr. FISH, and Mr. BADHAM.

H. Con. Res. 141: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H. Con. Res. 169: Mr. EDGAR, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. AU COIN, and Mrs. KENNELLY.

H. Con. Res. 175: Mr. TOWNS.

H. Res. 21: Mr. TAUKE, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. McKERNAN.

H. Res. 76: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FISH, Mrs. BURTON of California, and Mr. MOAKLEY.

H. Res. 167: Mr. VALENTINE and Mr. BROWN of Colorado.

H. Res. 188: Mr. MOODY and Mr. LaFALCE.

H. Res. 219: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. STARK, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARR, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. McGRATH.

H. Res. 234: Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. COBEY, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. McGRATH.

H. Res. 247: Mr. CONTE, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. McGRATH.